STUDIA PATRISTICA

SUPPLEMENT 4

Thedotus of Ancyra's Homilies and the Council of Ephesus (431)

by

LUISE MARION FRENKEL

PEETERS
LEUVEN – PARIS – BRISTOL, CT
2015

STUDIA PATRISTICA

SUPPLEMENTS

edited by

Allen Brent and Markus Vinzent

© Peeters Publishers — Louvain — Belgium 2015

All rights reserved, including the right to translate or to reproduce this book or parts thereof in any form.

D/2015/0602/33
ISBN: 978-90-429-3147-3

A catalogue record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

Printed in Belgium by Peeters, Leuven

'quomodo autem ueniet spiritus gratia orantibus eis
quibus interdicta est sacerdotalis oratio?'

John of Antioch (ACO I 4, 80, 16-7).

'It is with love that one ought to research what concerns the essence,
and without investigation, the meditation on the hidden (nature) is good.
Thus he who aims to study well is not blameworthy,
but he who composes his discourse in order to polemicise (is).'

Narsaï, Homily II, 55-8.

Contents

Preface ix
Introduction 1

1. Theodotus' ecclesiastic context 17
2. Theodotus in Ephesus 41
3. Character and theology of Theodotus' homilies 127

Conclusion 201

Appendix. Translation of Theodotus' conciliar homilies 209

A note on abbreviations and primary sources 247
Bibliography 257
Index locorum 277
Index of Old and New Testament passages 281
General Index 283

Preface

This book bears witness to the research and study I could undertake in Cambridge, and I thank Dr Thomas Graumann for agreeing to supervise the writing of the PhD thesis, guiding me on an unexpected enticing path. I am exceedingly grateful to the vast support he offered especially during the last year of the degree, and for his friendship since. I was fortunate in having as my doctoral examiners Prof. Richard Price and Dr Markus Plested, whose acute observations substantiated alternative perspectives and have led me to incorporate here significant refinements in the presentation of the arguments. I thank the disinterested help of Dr Sophie Lunn-Rockliffe, for reading the manuscript and offering precise corrections and clear advice. All errors that remain are of my responsibility, fruit of my undoing and stubbornness.

The generous support of the Gates Cambridge Trust Scholarship occasioned my research at Cambridge University, and this work incorporates the academic wishes and endeavours in Patristics and Late Antiquity seen there. I recall especially the seminars, reading groups, lectures and informal discussions led by Dr JF Coakley, Prof. John Marenbon and Dr James Aitken. Without the resources of the University Library, the monograph would never have been written thus. The collections of the Biblioteca Vaticana and of the Biblioteca Florestan Fernandes were valuable for its revision, and I thank the British School at Rome, which welcomed me while member of a BARDA project. I acknowledge the postdoctoral grant by Fapesp at DLCV/FFLCH-USP, where Profs. Marcos Martinho dos Santos and Paula da Cunha Corrêa offered much support and valuable advice. Finally, I thank Profs. Markus Vinzent and Allen Brent for their encouragement to publish the thesis, and Peeters Publishers for accepting it.

Introduction

Theodotus of Ancyra's participation in the Council of Ephesus in 431 is described in the *gesta*, and the major collections of documents of this council include between two and four of his homilies. A few other homilies and treatises were also preserved, although in fewer copies. The four texts which appeared in print in the course of the seventeenth century may have paved his way into history and Mariology books, yet seldom beyond the mention of his name. Likewise, the recollection of his conciliar participation may have warranted that he was occasionally remembered as a saint in the orthodox churches,[1] yet a hagiography of the Bishop Theodotus does not seem to have ever been written. In patristic scholarship attention is rarely devoted to him. For the most part, he is mentioned in short lexicon articles and the occasional aside in the narratives about major events to which he is linked.

The early church historians seldom mentioned Theodotus and usually referred to his participation at the Council of Ephesus anonymously.[2] From a few references a standardised narrative of the events was built, found in most dictionaries and scholarly literature about councils or homiletics. Theodotus is described as a former friend of Nestorius, ardent supporter of Cyril, a promoter of Marian feasts. The same scarce available information about Theodotus is found repeatedly throughout recent centuries.[3] The variant phrasing suggests a reworking and interpreting with greater or lesser accuracy of prior scholars, going back to the early editors of Theodotus' works.[4] The entries in the major twentieth-century dictionaries which care to cite Theodotus,[5] as well as

[1] For example, 'καὶ ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις Θεόδοτος (Ἀγκύρας οὗτος ἐπεστάτησε)', Photius *Bibliotheca* 231 (287a, 17-8), R. Henry (ed.), *Photius. Bibliothèque V* (1967), 66. Photius lists Theodotus among the authors of excerpts (χρῆσις) which were contained in the same volume (τεῦχος) of Sophronius of Jerusalem's synodical letter to Honorius.

[2] Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica* VII 34, 14; Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopulus *Historia ecclesiastica* XIV, 34, 70.

[3] Exemplified in Latin by A. Gallandi, *Bibliotheca veterum patrum* 9 (1773), and in vernacular by L.E.D. Pin and W. Wotton, *The Authors that Flourished in the Latter Part of the Fifth Century* (1693), 46, and the briefer J.L. Mosheim and J. Murdock, 'Primitive period' (1832), 394.

[4] *E.g.* the editors of the conciliar collections, such as G.D. Mansi, *Ab anno CCCCXXXI.* (1761), following the Roman edition of 1608 – on which, see ACO I 1/1, xviii, as well as the editors of a treatise by Theodotus, first L. Holstenius, *Theodoti Ancyrani Expositio* (1669), and then F. Combefis, *Theodoti Ancyrani, Adversus Nestorium* (1675).

[5] For example, J. Hofer, *et al.* (eds), 'Teufel bis Zypern' (1965) (LThK^2), 10, F.W. Bautz and T. Bautz (eds), 'Stoss, Veit bis Tiefenthaler, Joseph' (1996), as well as Bardy in A. Vacant *et al.*, *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* (1915-1950), XV, I, 328-30, S. Döpp and W. Geerlings (eds), *Dictionary of Early Christian Literature* (2000), A.F.v. Pauly and G. Wissowa, *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie* (1934), *etc.* Notice that he is absent from H. Cancik and H. Schneider, *Der neue Pauly* (1996-2003), M. Viller *et al.*, *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* (1932ff.), E. Ferguson *et al.*, *Encyclopedia of early Christianity* (1997), *etc.*

scholars who mention him,[6] mainly refer to one modern source[7] as having compiled reliably the available information. It is painstaking to trace the ancient sources of many statements in modern reference works, and this may have contributed to some imaginative biographical narrative writing.[8] Recently, some new information has become available,[9] but until the last decade there was not much scholarship on Theodotus.

Nothing is known about Theodotus' birth-place, family background, education or career. It is usually conjectured that he was born after 381. It is not known when Theodotus became bishop of Ancyra.[10] A late dating[11] could place some of his homilies prior to his tenure as bishop.[12] Appointments of bishops who were not native to the city were not uncommon, and some episcopal mobility was still possible, but when necessary it will be assumed that Theodotus was native to Ancyra. There is no evidence that his election was marked by simony or violence.[13]

Theodotus' works can be divided in four genres: records of his statements, homilies of varying character (short and long, polemic and festal), letters and treatises. The transmission of most items in the first three categories relates to collections of conciliar documents, often linked to the sessions. Late antique editors did not include Theodotus' theological treatises in collections of conciliar

[6] It would be an interesting exercise of textual criticism to follow the incorporation of mistakes into this picture. Particularly misguiding is the statement that Theodotus wrote numerous homilies, which cannot stand even counting those of dubious authorship, but may have been attractive to a scholarly perspective looking for earliest instances, *e.g.* of a liturgical feast, and emphasising the occurrence of examples.

[7] O. Bardenhewer, *Das fünfte Jahrhundert* (1923), sometimes also O. Bardenhewer (ed.), *Marienpredigten aus der Väterzeit* (1934).

[8] Two very important contributions of the last fifty years, which offer an image of Theodotus significantly different of what is found in the following pages are J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 61-5, and C. Foss, 'Late antique and Byzantine Ankara' (1977), 54, where the timeframe is questionable, the description as 'leading figure' should be qualified, and there is no evidence to warrant describing Theodotus as an (active) correspondent, his sermons as numerous, and his treatises as long.

[9] Best discussed in M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960) and *id.*, 'Une homélie grecque inédite' (1969).

[10] His age cannot be conjectured, *cf.* R.V. Dam, 'Bishops and clerics' (2011), 239. To compare, Nestorius (*c.* 370-451) probably was around 50 when he became bishop of Constantinople, while Cyril (*c.* 380-444) became patriarch of Alexandria already in 412, with only *c.* 32 years.

[11] C. Foss, 'Late antique and Byzantine Ankara' (1977), 54 situates his episcopacy in 430 to 440.

[12] For example, R. Caro, *La homilética mariana griega* (1972), 173 dates Theodotus' Homily V to the first quarter of the fifth-century.

[13] However, Ancyrans were familiar with tensions and irregularities in episcopal elections. For example, Eusebius, probably Theodotus' immediate successor in Ancyra took bribes and disorder for granted: ACO II 1/3, 97[456], 37 - 98[457], 5, *cf.* P. Norton, *Episcopal Elections* (2007), 182. See also T.D. Barnes, 'The crimes of Basil of Ancyra' (1996) and P.V. Nuffelen, 'The rhetoric of rules' (2011).

documents about Ephesus I, even though they could contain similarly post-Ephesian texts, *e.g.* Cyril *Quod unus sit Christus* in the *Qērellos* collection.[14]

In this book, Theodotus of Ancyra's homilies are analysed in relation to his participation at the Council of Ephesus I (431) to shed light on the mechanisms of establishing and divulging theological clarification. Against the background of church and society in his time, Theodotus was a bishop who stood out in the Council as well as in the Christological debate, without being a leading character in either. Theodotus' participation can be taken as representative of all the other bishops gathered in Ephesus and their engagement in the conciliar processes. Theodotus' role in Ephesus offers a complex image of the mechanisms of underscoring theology in authoritative teaching received from tradition and clarified at councils.

All extant works by Theodotus focus on the Christological debate. It is shown in this monograph that the homilies preached by Theodotus in Ephesus clarify his self-professed motivation to exhort the bishops to defend orthodoxy. He expected preachers and bishops to convey the faith taught by the church to all Christians, holding them responsible for the salvation of their audience as much as their own, to achieve a universal orthodoxy that could ensure the fulfilment of salvation. Therefore, when problems about a tenant of faith, like a proper Christological understanding, were found among a congregation, the preacher was bound to convey the view anchored in the authoritative tradition. As part of this wider aim, Theodotus preached at the council specifically in support of the authority of the Cyrillian sessions, so that the theology endorsed therein would be acknowledged as part of the teaching of the church.

Before presenting an outline of this book, the main methodological choices are discussed and then related to traditional fields of study, followed by an overview of relevant aspects of homiletic and conciliar scholarship.

Aims and methodology

The main purpose of this study is to analyse how Theodotus argued in Homilies III and VI, during the Council of Ephesus, for a mechanism of establishing the theological content as orthodox in relation to an ecclesiastic authority which included the sessions themselves. It also addresses possible reasons for the inclusion of these homilies in collections of conciliar documents. This requires a good grasp of Theodotus' activity at the council, and some knowledge of his theology before and during the council.

In so doing, the analysis touches on two separate fields of scholarship, that is: research concerning the Council of Ephesus, and late antique homiletics. It also engages tangentially with Mariology, whose scholars have likewise been

[14] B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 3 (1977). Theodotus *Expositio symboli Nicaeni* is a line by line commentary of the Nicene creed with extensive Christological digressions. In the 'Books against Nestorius', Theodotus refutes a Nestorian *florilegium*.

interested in some of the sources treated here. The present approach turns toward, and contributes to the understanding of the Council of Ephesus only in so far as it draws attention to specific, often neglected aspects of conciliar interaction, foremost to the significance of contributions by apparently 'lesser' participants, since most studies focus on the main theological and political players. That this contribution consists not only in interventions at meetings but also, importantly, in other means by which participants engaged in the problems in hand and, simultaneously, expressed their self-identity and self-understanding of their role in a council, is the particular purpose of this study. Preaching is identified as central to this effort. Conciliar homilies are not only mostly neglected in historical analyses of councils, but also figure seldom in studies about preaching. For these reasons, this study also contributes to scholarship on late antique homiletics. It has the advantage of analysing preaching in a comparatively clearly delimited context, whereas most homiletic studies face significantly greater uncertainties of historical and theological context. The analysis offered here aims to make contribution to both fields by addressing the homilies' relation to the council which circumscribes to some extent the composition and record of these texts. No reassessment of the Council of Ephesus beyond highlighting such additional dimensions is attempted nor will broad claims be made about late antique homiletics in general. Rather, since both perspectives enlighten each other, the engagement with conciliar and homiletical scholarship aims to contribute, by combining them, a distinct understanding of the available evidence on challenges which bishops faced in relation to the Christological debate around 430 and the imperially summoned Council of Ephesus and how preaching offered them one important way to meet them.

The Council of Ephesus is a challenging research topic. Looking at details usually casts doubts on general analyses, often sprung from scholarship aiming to discuss facts, ideas and problems related to later periods, especially those raised by the Council of Chalcedon. Much research has focused on those who had leading roles at Ephesus or afterwards: principally on Cyril, Nestorius, and to a lesser extent Juvenal of Jerusalem and John of Antioch. In view of the factional character of the council, the groups of bishops have often been portrayed as an anonymised mass of voters, barely individualised by their names and sees in the votes. Theodotus stands out among the metropolitan bishops with his contributions, but does not reach the historical importance of someone like Juvenal or Acacius of Melitene. The perspective of homiletic studies helps to temper the representation of Theodotus' motivation as stemming mainly from the disputes over episcopal territorial authority.

It may be argued[15] that the compilers of the collections included material like homilies or letters to provide sources for excerpts that can be taken out to

[15] See p. 120.

expand or illustrate theological or ecclesiastic questions. Precisely for such use theologians and historians who approach the collections of conciliar documents occasionally pay attention to texts which are not cited in the minutes,[16] and they seldom consider the nature of the text. They neglect questions which these texts present, sometimes uniquely, such as how a bishop preached to his assembled fellow bishops, which this study addresses.

Theodotus' statements and actions in Ephesus have been mentioned in several descriptions of the council of 431, to widely varied conclusions,[17] and even analysed in detail.[18] Their rhetorical aspects were highlighted, but without relation to the persuasive role of homilies.[19] He was a signatory of several letters included in conciliar collections, which have been extensively analysed to order and discuss conciliar events,[20] but seldom has there been an investigation of the sources of the images and phrases they contain, and how they relate to other documents from the council.

The study of the conciliar material is hampered by the character of the collections. Currently, they are 'widely' available, but presented in a complex and difficult way.[21] This may have hindered research in some areas, for example, prosopographical studies of bishops who, like Theodotus, at first glance did not have a prominent role. In so far as it is possible to ascertain some facts about these individuals, they should be taken into account when examining the composition of the collections, especially when material prior to the council was included, as in Theodotus' case. Theodotus' involvement in the council, perhaps only as a second tier participant, reflected rather than determined his approach to the theological aspects of Christology. His pastoral concern was constantly present, and he reminded the bishops of the universal consequences of their decisions. Until the impact of the events in Ephesus on the world view and pastoral care of other bishops has been discussed in greater detail, remarks based on Theodotus' works remain tentative, for lack of comparative parallels.

[16] For example, letters, homilies, treatises prior to the council, from friend and foe, which were read aloud to participants of the sessions in Ephesus.

[17] E. Schwartz, 'Cyrill und der Mönch Viktor' (1926), 22, R. MacMullen, *Voting about God* (2006), 62, F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), 33, L.E.D. Pin and W. Wotton, *The Authors* (1693), 46.

[18] T. Graumann, *Die Kirche der Väter* (2002), 362, 377.

[19] Almost focused on in R. MacMullen, *Voting about God* (2006), 62.

[20] See J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 90ff., E. Schwartz, 'Cyrill und der Mönch Viktor' (1926), L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 220ff., C. Fraisse-Coué, 'Le débat théologique au temps de Théodose II' (1995), with references to earlier literature.

[21] E. Schwartz, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum* (1914ff.). See F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), 235ff. Initial versions of a forthcoming English translation by R. Price and T. Graumann were helpful.

Interdisciplinary approach

A study of Theodotus of Ancyra's homilies said to have been performed in A.D. 431 during the Council of Ephesus can be done from a range of perspectives and focus on specific themes. The following paragraphs discuss biographical, historical, literary and theological approaches and point out what this study does, and, perhaps more importantly, also explain what it does not.

Biographical study?

It is attractive to do a biographical study of a bishop who seems in advance reasonably characteristic of the masses of bishops who attended synods and councils and are at best remembered by their name in the presence and voters lists. His representativeness is best explained by comparison with the leaders who have received significant scholarly attention. First, Theodotus is not one of the main characters, at the centre of praise and reproach, as is the case of Nestorius, Cyril, John of Antioch and Memnon. Secondly, since the focus is on pre-Chalcedonian events, also bishops such as Juvenal and Acacius of Melitene are not good paradigms, inasmuch as many of their actions and their reputation are informed by the synods and councils of 448-51. Furthermore, following the late antique representation of their successes and ambitions, studies of the changes in church political relevance of their sees or their influence on theological debates centre on their involvement and gains. However, Juvenal's career and tactics, for example, have so far not yet been deemed typical of fifth-century bishops, and are usually caricatured as quite the opposite. After close inspection of the small available body of evidence it is shown that none of these drawbacks apply to Theodotus. As a consequence, this study faces the disadvantage of a significant lack of comparative material and similar scholarship.

Theodotus' works and involvement in main historical events is probably best paralleled by Proclus of Constantinople. However, more information on Proclus can be found in ancient sources such as church histories and numerous letters and testimonies. Furthermore, Proclus *Tomus ad Armenios* was far better known at all times and more influential than Theodotus' theological works. Recent scholarship on Proclus typifies the potential of weaving the available information, reassessing previous interpretations of the political and ecclesiastic developments in a metropolis, and presenting an encompassing representation of the links between theological debates and official advancement of the growing Marian devotion.[22] The resulting complex picture serves well to set the scene for more specific studies which can alter or nuance this background.

[22] See N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003).

An advantage of a biographical approach is that it nuances generalising statements and inferences which can be drawn, for example, from the allegiance to theological parties or from the geographical location of the dioceses of members of this large body of characterless bishops. It also places Theodotus in the late antique framework, so that comparing the works and information available about him and about bishops such as Proclus, Juvenal and Memnon sanctions the use of arguments of silence more often than would generally seem reasonable. Cyzicus, Constantinople, Jerusalem and Ephesus present valid analogies, and permit the unrealised potential importance of Ancyra and of Theodotus' participation to be delineated. The lack of documentation about Theodotus, which could have been transmitted by the same patterns which preserved the information about John of Antioch, Nestorius, Firmus and Proclus, is therefore used to ground claims about Theodotus or at least about the ancient reception of the works and deeds of the bishop of Ancyra.

Considering the quality and quantity of the relevant information, the biographical study is only possible if a cautious approach is adopted, and anachronistic inferences, including those from mid or late fifth-century sources, are avoided. The detailed reading of the evidence in its historical and social context also shows that some portraits of Theodotus' conciliar participation are not likely to represent accurately his actions, motivations and intentions.

Historical study?

The outcome of the research of Theodotus' homilies does not alter significantly our understanding of the events of 431, in part because the information about Theodotus' participation has already been taken into account. The historical study offered here questions some interpretations of the characters and actions in these events, by advancing alternative connections of the scant and generally unreliable information.

The present analysis contributes significantly to our understanding of late antique processes of shaping identity, changing the balance, achieving consensus, and presenting it where there is none. The focus is on the means to preserve and shape allegiances, to defend a view, in short, not on the substance of the decision, but on the decision making process. As such it dialogues with a 'total historical' approach to late antiquity that is always indebted to Eduard Schwartz's contributions.[23] The research of the mechanisms operating in late antique society is connected to the valorisation of traditions, rituals, communications, and control mechanisms in the historical studies, especially over the last fifty years.

[23] See C.E. Straw and R. Lim (eds), *The Past Before Us* (2004), 12 and P. Gemeinhardt, *Das lateinische Christentum und die antike pagane Bildung* (2007), 2-4.

Study of literary genres?

The analysis of Theodotus' homilies which were either first delivered during the Council, or read to the assembled bishops falls in the scope of homiletic studies. A literary research of its rhetoric and elocution is fundamental to achieve relevant historical conclusions. Furthermore, it is among the first case-studies of conciliar homilies and stands out for focusing on the works which are not by Cyril. However, Theodotus' homilies are not representative of this category of 'conciliar sermons by "others"', no more so than Cyril's are typical of 'conciliar homilies in general'. It is argued that this set of works is defined by its performance setting and transmission and not by internal characteristics, and therefore does not yield itself to inferences on literary genres. 'Conciliar' serves to describe a small corpus of text, which does not allow generalising inferences, but suffices to show that preachers in late antiquity did not develop a specific type of sermonising when addressing bishops gathered for a synod. The conjunction of genre and transmission exemplifies late antique rhetorical strategies of persuasion, but does not embody a type of sermon. The careful assessment of the very lacunal information about delivery setting and historical context, and the detailed analysis of rhetoric, elocution and argument in the context of other conciliar discourses and documents lead to a problematisation of the concept of a homiletic genre up to the fifth century. The reader is reminded that when discussing the aim of discourse, or what a text wants to achieve, this cannot be related to any putative intention or frame of mind of the author.

Theological analysis?

The last part of this monograph, dedicated to some aspects of Theodotus' theology, serves a very specific argumentative purpose in the analysis of conciliar homilies. It does not attempt to give any definitive answer, not even on specific topics such as Theodotus' Christology and ecclesiology. The discussion of select topics raises questions which show that Theodotus' homilies transmitted in conciliar collections are too small and varied a sample to allow any deeper inference to be tested sufficiently.

A thorough analysis of Theodotus' theology would require a careful investigation of his theological treatises. This goes far beyond the scope of this work first because the links to the conciliar events of A.D. 431 are not straightforward. Secondly, internal difficulties abound, not least due to the lack of critical editions. Finally, unlike the homiletic corpus, the comparative material, consisting of similar treatises, notably Cyril's works, has not yet been studied in detail while taking into account the wider socio-political issues of the conciliar disputes.

The interdisciplinary approach confirms that Theodotus' influence was never significant and that references to him usually fall in three categories: they either corroborate a Cyrillian view, or they offer a Cyrillian perspective without being

by Cyril, and this either because of a deliberate attempt to be Cyrillian without quoting Cyril, or because an equivalent passage was not found in the available works by Cyril. Therefore, a study of Theodotus' theology would have a very limited church-historical interest. It will, in due time, be an important contribution to our understanding of the complex patterns of theological views in an important moment of church history, and of the development of theological concepts and doctrine.

The little which the texts yield with enough clarity on the fifth-century Christological debate has a generalising tone which resonates of comprehensive theological analyses, which have already taken in account, to some extent, a few of Theodotus' works, especially Homily I. Theodotus' theology has been little studied[24] beyond some remarks on the interplay and relations of influence of Theodotus' and Cyril's Christology.[25] Likewise, a study of the presentation of disputed theological topics in homiletic form in the light of the contemporary events in Theodotus' homilies read at the Council would redundantly echo the recent scholarship on the bishop of Constantinople, despite the differences of Theodotus' and Proclus' theology. For all these reasons, a proper theological analysis of the conciliar homilies is best postponed until the differences and similarities of Theodotus' approach to the debates of his time are better understood.

Although this study is a self-contained work, much is, admittedly, expected of the ideal reader. Besides some knowledge about the Cyrillian and Oriental sessions in Ephesus 431 and an awareness of the variety of modern interpretations of the socio-political context, the historical events and the theological disputes, it is hoped that the reader is familiar with recent scholarship on homiletics, especially on Proclus' activity in Constantinople, and on Cyrillian theology and church political manoeuvres. This study contributes insights to nuance a global picture of the fifth-century Roman Empire of the East, which the sources focused on cannot yield on their own, and it refrains from echoing redundantly the admirable scholarship of the last decades on topics which are not central to the study.

Homiletic and conciliar studies

Research on the homilies of late antiquity is a rather young field. A great number were neglected for centuries, and those which have been read were seldom placed in historical context, far less approached considering what they represent

[24] M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960) analyses Homily V. G.L. Castro, *Teodoto di Ancira* (1992), 25-36 offers a theological review which unfortunately relies much on the doubtful *Hom. i. s. Deip.* CPG 6136. They have shown, together with N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 16-25, 56-71, and M. Aubineau, 'Un recueil de textes «Chrysostomiens»' (1990), Theodotus' relation to the tradition received from earlier Christian writers like Irenaeus, Clement, Origen, *etc.*

[25] A. van Roey, 'Le florilège nestorien dans le «Traité contre Nestorius»' (1975), *id.*, 'Le florilège nestorien de l'Adversus Nestorium' (1981).

in the successive stages of transmission. Generally, homilies have only been mined for their content.[26] This has generated a significant disconnection between text and context. Scholars and literary critics who pointed to the existence of specifically Christian genres, like homiletics and hagiography, were usually concerned with proposing definitions which encompass modern practices. Subsequently, the characterisations of homilies attempt to cover and circumscribe the body of texts which have been handed down as such by tradition and a number of texts which bear hallmarks of sermons, or can be classified as such, or are so for lack of better alternatives. A conventional definition like 'the public explanation of a sacred doctrine or of a sacred text'[27] places great emphasis on the exegetical element. Many 'homilies' then only marginally fit in this definition, since in a narrow sense, they are not only exegetical. Also definitions which additionally emphasise moral exhortations, do not describe well many works, even when the scholars rely on theorisations by patristic authors and take into consideration late antique expectations.[28] Similar problems are found in the description of other Christian genres, and the recent fruitful discussion in hagiography, on which texts it deals with,[29] may help homiletics to likewise reassess the role of the works without reducing the size of the corpus.

Preaching was a key vehicle for the communication between clergy and their congregation.[30] Often letters reached their intended audience, or a wider one, by being read as homilies.[31] The reaction and participation of the audience varied much,[32] and generally the available information points to an inhomogeneous gathering of men and women of various social and economic extractions. However, occasionally the audience could be formed mainly of equally ranked people, like bishops assembled for a synod, and homiletics in the context of synodical meetings have recently received increasing interest.[33] This work contributes to homiletic studies an analysis of conciliar sermons (or homilies), as I call those transmitted in collections of conciliar documents or said to have been first delivered to a gathered council.

[26] M.B. Cunningham, 'Preaching and the community' (1990), 29.

[27] F. Siegert, 'Homily and panegyrical sermon' (1997), 421 used, for example, by S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004), 190. See also G. Dunn, 'Aristotle and the art of preaching' (1998).

[28] See C. Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity* (2005), 55 on Gregory the Great, and S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004), 193 on Justin Martyr and Eusebius of Cæsarea.

[29] P. Hatlie, *The Monks and Monasteries* (2007), 9-16.

[30] P. Allen, 'Homilies as a source for social history' (1993), 260-1.

[31] R. MacMullen, *Voting about God* (2006), 62.

[32] An extensive literature on the numerous ancient sources can be exemplified by J.LR. Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication* (2006), 46; N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 25, 54.

[33] Witnessed in informal discussions during British conferences, and in papers like O. Shchuryk, 'The Christological Position of Acacius' (2010).

Patristic homilies cannot be classified easily, even when categories are allowed that are rather imprecise and can include many texts, as in the case of the set of exegetical, polemical, exhortative, panegyrical texts, for particular occasions and feasts, and on particular doctrinal and moral subjects homilies.[34] Conciliar homilies, for example, usually fit well into several of these types at once. Concerning the homilies in the collections related to Ephesus I, it is convenient to notice that the homilies can be split in two groups based on their length. The homilies prior to the council[35] are significantly longer than the sermons which are described as delivered in Ephesus. The contrast in length is particularly neat for Theodotus' homilies. This nomenclature will be often used in this study, in view of its advantages over disputable labels, since, for example, the long homilies were mostly festal or doctrinal when first delivered, while the shorter are in almost equal measure polemical, exhortative, panegyrical and doctrinal.

In the steadily growing body of research on fifth-century festal homilies, the texts are little differentiated by the mode of transmission. Much scholarship on homilies is devoted to establishing the authorship of anonymous texts or of those lumped into the works of some author. For example, many pseudo-Chrysostomian sermons are now ascribed to Proclus and Severian of Gabala.[36] However, the core of Theodotus' works seems too small to attempt further attributions to his name.[37]

Theodotus' preaching suggests that he had received a good intellectual training and Ancyra was traditionally linked to Antioch as a centre of learning. Together with a literal reading of the evidence of his friendship to Nestorius, Theodotus' education can be associated with Antioch.[38] Theodotus' homilies have passages of elaborate rhetoric[39] which were likely remarkable even to the congregations of large urban centres, used to the wide range of rhetorical flourishes common in late antiquity. Theodotus' homilies aimed to move the

[34] P. Allen, 'Homilies as a source for social history' (1993), 263.

[35] ACO I 1/1, 103ff., ACO I 1/2, 73ff.

[36] For example, M. Aubineau, 'Un recueil de textes «Chrysostomiens»' (1990), 393; S.J. Voicu, 'Note su un'omelia pseudocrisostomica per il natale' (1992), 354-5.

[37] See M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie grecque inédite' (1969). Still, the literature about pseudo-Chrysostomian works and Severian's and Proclus' sermons contributes to place Theodotus' style and approach in its late antique context. See for example, J. Kecskeméti, 'Sévérien de Gabala' (1996), K.-H. Uthemann, 'Die Sprachtheorie des Eunomios von Kyzikos' (1993).

[38] A fuller picture of classical education in Ancyra, Alexandria and Antioch can be found in E.J. Watts, *City and School* (2006), R. Cribiore, *The School of Libanius* (2007), P. Gemeinhardt, *Das lateinische Christentum und die antike pagane Bildung* (2007) and C. Foss, 'Late antique and Byzantine Ankara' (1977). On the intellectual training of Cyril and Nestorius, see L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004) and H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009).

[39] Occasional textual value judgements or allusions to poetic qualities should be understood in the light of A. Spira and H. R. Drobner, *Kleine Schriften* (2007), 214-8.

audience and also resorted to emotional arguments, ranging from violent steadfastness to pious frailty.

Shorter homilies have in general been rather neglected.[40] Widespread assumptions about sequential preaching predominate,[41] but precise sources for such ensembles are mostly lacking.[42] This applies also to the short homilies in the conciliar collections. The few detailed studies of conciliar homilies[43] suggest sermons may have been important for the solidification of alliances and in trying to make theological views accepted, and stand as witness to the mechanisms employed at councils to achieve both. The emphasis on persuasion, the extensive use of *psogos* imply that care is needed with assumptions about the genre of homiletics, and that topics from late antique rhetoric are relevant for the analysis of the homilies.[44]

In contrast, long conciliar homilies have received attention alongside other texts prior to the council that are in the conciliar collections, such as letters. However, notice has seldom been paid to possible performance in Ephesus, impact on the audience, or role in the collections.[45] Most of these earlier works are not mentioned in the *gesta*, but come interspersed with those which, like Cyril's letters, were read at the sessions. These, as well as some long texts prior to the council included in the acts like Proclus' Homily I, have merited attention heedless of their role in Ephesus or in collections.[46] Some homilies in the collections have been contextualised against the theological debate and the relation between church and politics, and help the texts to become more than sources of citations or examples of earliest liturgical practices.[47] The connection of the homilies to the sessions and other events, and to the preparation of the conciliar collections has not been explored fully yet.[48] The analysis is guided

[40] For a few examples studied in detail, see P. Allen, 'Homilies as a source for social history' (1993), 262-3.

[41] A. Olivar, *La predicación* (1991), 555-9.

[42] See some discussion in P. Allen and W. Mayer, 'Computer and homily' (1993), N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), and J.H. Barkhuizen, 'Proclus of Constantinople: a popular preacher' (1998), as well as O. Shchuryk, 'The Christological Position of Acacius' (2010).

[43] S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004) and O. Shchuryk, 'The Christological Position of Acacius' (2010) have, respectively, researched Cyril's and Acacius' polemic homilies. See also I. Rucker, 'Ephesinische Konzilsakten in armenischgeorgischer Überlieferung' (1930), B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979).

[44] See C. Ronning, 'Rituale der Rhetorik – Rhetorik der Rituale' (2003), and pp. 148ff.

[45] F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), 33.

[46] *Ibid.*; J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004); N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), J.H. Barkhuizen, 'Proclus of Constantinople, Homily 1' (1994), *id.*, *Proclus, Bishop of Constantinople – Homilies on the Life of Christ* (2001).

[47] N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003).

[48] It may be symptomatic that the vast majority of the research about homilies has been published as papers in journals or collections. Papers on homilies are most frequently isolated case studies, despite some projects of building databases for comparative studies, *e.g.* P. Allen and W. Mayer, 'Computer and homily' (1993). Some studies have placed homilies into the context of

by questions for which conciliar context is little relevant or even a handicap. Especially the Marian content of some conciliar homilies has drawn scholarly attention, without considering their transmission and placement in the collections, rather, they are briskly separated from the remaining ones.[49] Furthermore, the motivation for these studies favours, even imposes, an anachronistic reading of the texts, looking for answers to questions[50] which were not the leading topics of their time. Symptomatically, the dubious homilies are then equally valuable sources of examples.[51]

A multidisciplinary scholarship on homiletics has highlighted, for example, the literary aspects which reflect topics of classical rhetoric, and the social information which can be drawn from the texts. Such insights have bearing on conciliar homilies, but they fall short of taking into account the relation of these texts to the events of the council.[52] As for research on liturgy of Theodotus' period,[53] when his works and deeds are used, the dialogue with the points of view of history and even of Mariology seems insufficient.[54] In short, the great variety of partial independent approaches has hampered a better understanding of Theodotus' opus, whether pastoral or literary.

The relation of the Ephesian conciliar homilies to the events at or around the Council of 431 is exemplified in two recent studies. An interesting albeit brief study of Acacius' homilies[55] took into account sources extant only in languages

an author's opus. This could be done with particular success for Proclus, *e.g.* J.H. Barkhuizen, *Proclus, Bishop of Constantinople – Homilies on the Life of Christ* (2001), N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003). These studies exemplify the wide range of texts classified as homilies, and give one example of the polemic character of sermons, but outside conciliar settings.

[49] For example, to restrict the analysis to only two of Theodotus' homilies in Greek conciliar collections, it is claimed simply that 'the third one is an attack against Nestorius, without any Marian element' R. Caro, *La homilética mariana griega* (1972), 158. He does not esteem highly Theodotus' homilies that he analyses. With a focus on the development of the Arian cult, R. Caro, *La homilética mariana griega* (1972), 27 considers a homily by Ps. Athanasius, which presents an Antiochene view, far more relevant than those delivered by Theodotus or Acacius in Ephesus. See also M. Jugie (ed.), *Homélies mariales* (1926), 289-93.

[50] Sprung from systematic theology, history of dogmas, anthropology and sociology.

[51] Thus excerpts of the dubious *in s. deiparam et in nativitatem domini* are translated alongside passages of conciliar homilies in P. C. Miller, *Women in Early Christianity* (2005), 294-5, one of the few translations into English of 'Theodotus' homilies'. A wider array of texts is made available in G. Gharib, *et al.*, *Padri e altri autori greci* (2001), 497-514, a comparable Italian volume. G.L. Castro, *Teodoto di Ancira* (1992) translates indiscriminately all Greek homilies. I only had access to this volume and to F. E. Sciuto, *Un episodio sconosciuto della controversia cristologica* (1984) during the last stages of proof-reading.

[52] For example, in R. Caro, *La homilética mariana griega* (1972), 157, 167.

[53] As in M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), M. Fassler, 'The first Marian feast' (2001), 36, 65.

[54] However, E. Schwartz, *Zwei Predigten Hippolyts* (1936), although not on conciliar homilies, exemplifies an approach to homilies which explores seemingly unrelated works, often bringing together excerpts, and developing aspects which spring forth from this juxtaposition.

[55] O. Shchuryk, 'The Christological Position of Acacius' (2010).

other than Greek or Latin to shed light on the Greek text in conciliar collections. However, it seems an isolated case study within a research project more interested in post-Ephesian developments. A more extensive work analyses Cyril's conciliar homilies and explores how he became a 'church father' for the Byzantine church and Nestorius an archetypal heretic for the Eastern church 'in relation to a broader literary context by examining the full range of literary genres, including letters, homilies, conciliar acts, exegetical and Christological treatises, and ecclesiastical narratives.'[56] There is, however, some imprecision in the relation of the homilies to the events, and their impact on the council could be considered more deeply.[57] The texts are analysed thoroughly, but they remain tools for an analysis of Cyril's situation in Ephesus, which is different from most bishops[58] in so far as he places himself as leader of the bishops and tries to defend this.[59]

In the corpus of homilies from the Council of Ephesus I, Cyril is the best represented author,[60] with twice as many conciliar homilies than Theodotus and a similar situation where some of his works predating the council were read to the assembled bishops. However, in contrast to Theodotus, Cyril's homilies are the discourse of a bishop who knows that in a conciliar session one of his works had been voted on as paradigm of orthodoxy, and that this happened, to an extent unknown to us, as a consequence of his own preparations for the council. As for the other authors of conciliar homilies, first, some are like Cyril personally involved in the outcome of the council, or with a smaller homiletic corpus. Secondly, about many there is less biographical information than about Theodotus, so that less historical data can be used as discussed above. Finally, the conciliar collections do not transmit nor record the reading of works these other authors of conciliar sermons wrote before the Council. Therefore, Theodotus is the best choice for a representative study of conciliar studies.

Bearing in mind the differences, the studies of Cyril of Alexandria's and Acacius of Melitene's preaching in Ephesus provide helpful models for approaching Theodotus' works. Further significant links can be established between Theodotus' actions and works, and those of Cyril and Nestorius, the main protagonists. Theodotus not only actively contributed to the Cyrillian Council, both at the sessions and between them, but also shared many of Cyril's theological views.

A lengthy analysis of Theodotus' participation at the council is meant to widen the range of interpretations of the participation of the bishops in a

[56] S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004), 7.

[57] T. Graumann, 'Review of *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy*' (2007).

[58] Already in Constantinople 381, Gregory Nazianzen was in a similar predicament.

[59] T. Graumann, 'Kirchliche Identität und bischöfliche Selbstinszenierung' (2003), J.A. McGuckin, *St. Gregory of Nazianzus* (2001), 350.

[60] Portrayed in S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004).

context where not even the activity of the handful of leading bishops is well known. In contrast to Cyril,[61] Theodotus was not placing himself as leader, but advocating for the validity of someone else's leadership, that is, Cyril's.[62] It follows that there was a need to advocate for the existence of a leader. Although this rationalisation of the historical situation is not stated, Theodotus' arguments dwell especially on who should occupy the leadership and how far reaching (beyond the council) it should go. Theodotus based his preferences on soundness of teaching.

The inferences about Theodotus are to some extent representative of many other bishops in the first half of the fifth century in Asia Minor, especially of authors of conciliar homilies.[63] The reception of Theodotus' works and deeds, together with works by Severian of Gabala and Proclus of Constantinople, allows valuable parallels to be drawn to their homiletics, which is more widely researched.[64] The historical and literary pieces of evidence about Theodotus come together to make this endeavour rewarding, yet the paucity of references inevitably makes some conclusions hypothetical. It follows that conclusions seem to become impossible when even less fathomable evidence is extant, as in the case of most late antique bishops and preachers.

In the following pages, strands occasionally pointed out in earlier scholarship, but seldom brought together more than passingly, are integrated in a still neglected small example. Because the corpus is limited and rather well circumscribed, and the debate quite well located in only a few years, it favours the development of connections and interpretations. Providing a test case which has potentially much wider implications, it advances the scholarship on conciliar activity and the preaching of late antique bishops.

After a brief historical contextualisation, Chapter 2 describes conciliar activity, closely analysing Theodotus' participation, and then describes elements of his literary output, especially of style and circumstance. Chapter 3 begins with a discussion of the relation between the works and the contexts from which they came, and in which they were received by the various audiences. Finally, it analyses the theological content of the homilies, considering that defence of the faith prompted their composition.

In the conciliar homilies, Theodotus argues that an orthodox church, where all members had a proper understanding and acceptance of theology, was a *sine qua non* condition for the salvific validity and effect of the incarnation.

[61] See *ibid.*, 296-8.

[62] Similar conclusions apply to other bishops at Ephesus, especially Rheginus of Cyprus and Acacius.

[63] For example, the collection transmitted in Ethiopic. See B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979).

[64] See B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.3 (1980), K.-H. Uthemann, 'Forms of communication in the homilies of Severian of Gabala' (1998), J. Quasten, *The Golden Age of Greek Patristic Literature* (1960), 484-6 and references therein.

For him, this faith had its anchor in the scriptures and in the faith of the fathers, and lent itself to be expressed in short slogan-like passages and especially through the Nicene creed.[65] These reliable 'unchanging' authoritative statements would anchor the faith. Theodotus preached to the conciliar bishops defending that conciliar decisions ought to be grounded on these pillars. He relied on their authority when preaching in Ancyra, both before and after the council, and when writing his treatises. Theodotus' reliance on authority, on theological slogans, and the reticence towards investigation of theological matters is tentatively related to his appraisal of classical and religious education. It is suggested that his opinion was perhaps informed by contemporary events, where similar educational or theological backgrounds led to opposite approaches to theological problems, while from dissimilar circumstances came solutions which albeit not identical, agreed on the disputed matters of the time. In his life, he may have experienced how education, whether theological or philosophical, was not enough to lead to the right faith lastingly.

The analysis of Theodotus' homilies as theological preaching in a specific conciliar context and setting shapes and delimits the interest in homiletics, theology, the Council of Ephesus and its reception. The workings of the Cyrillian Council and the reception of its decisions and theological outcomes, the characteristics of conciliar sermons, the development of doctrine and church authority are not analysed in isolation, but as linked in Theodotus' works. This limits the engagement with Theodotus' activity and theology, his relation and contribution to Cyrillian theology and to Christology, even with his own theology and activity in other possible perspectives.[66] His homilies give a coherent example of the values which linked establishing and divulging theological clarifications to received authority.

[65] See p. 24 on Nicene *faith* and *creed*.

[66] The difficulty is compounded by the small body of extant texts.

1. Theodotus' ecclesiastic context

This chapter aims to address aspects of the world Theodotus lived in and describe the church of which he considered himself to be a member. Although multifaceted and displaying regional differences suppressed by later conciliar decisions, the characteristics of a typical metropolitan bishop support the claims that Theodotus lived and acted in Ancyra and its environs at least since becoming its titular, and when necessary it will be assumed that he was native of the capital of Galatia Prima. His works and deeds seem to reflect a good educational background, to some extent obtainable in those parts of the Anatolian plateau, or more probably in one of the cities famous for its schools. As bishop he was part of the structure of the church and had to engage with the wider problems of Christianity beyond his diocese. Among his duties was the participation in councils, and in 430 he was invited to an imperially summoned synod in Ephesus. Problems concerning the right understanding of the relation of the divine and human natures in Christ had just flared up between the bishops of Constantinople and Alexandria, two of the most important sees, reflecting different theological traditions. A brief description of some of the ways of communication places Theodotus' participation at the council in a wider context, providing parallels for speaking in sessions, preaching, and letters. As a member of the Cyrillian delegation to the emperor, he would have been involved with the mechanisms of the state and of the court, and aware of the extent to which the conventions of communication with the emperor applied to ecclesiastic representatives.

Theodotus of Ancyra's participation in the First Council of Ephesus in A.D. 431 is the only securely dated historic event of his life. He was the metropolitan bishop of a provincial city of significant wealth and importance in the Roman Empire ruled by the Theodosian dynasty. There is no information about his birth, and it is not known how long he had already been metropolitan of Ancyra when the council of 431 was called.[1] Bishops were not less than middle-aged, and thus Theodotus probably was born before 390.[2] Then, he was at least in his early 40's at the time of the council, and perhaps he reached a significant age of *c.* 65.[3] In this case, most if not all of his ecclesiastic career happened in the reign of Theodosius II.

[1] See pp. 2, 108.

[2] A plausible dating to 380's would place his education during the reign of Theodosius I (347-395), in the late career of Libanius, see p. 33.

[3] Theodotus of Ancyra died at least several months before Proclus of Constantinople, since Eusebius claims to have been appointed to the Ancyran see by Proclus at least some time before Proclus' death, in 446 (ACO II 1/3, 97-8[456-7]). Eusebius may not have been the immediate successor, and prolonged vacancies were common. See also F.W. Bautz and T. Bautz (eds), 'Stoss, Veit bis Tiefenthaler, Joseph' (1996), 997-9.

Sociopolitical and economical setting

Theodosius II was installed on the throne in 408, at the age of seven, and was to reign until 450. By 431, he had been ruling alone for fifteen years, but there were many at the court, especially the Augusta Pulcheria, who had still much influence. It has been highlighted how Theodosius II's balance of control with Pulcheria influenced events around the Council of Ephesus.[4] For those who had business with the emperor, including bishops, it was a situation which offered possibilities and risks alike. Even those with inside knowledge sometimes misjudged whom to address at court on what account.[5] Outside Constantinople most details about the court were probably unknown. Instead, a rather mythical view of the court held sway in the imagination of the local population, and even of the bureaucratic aristocracy. God-like[6] reverence was due to the emperor, whether he was a strong commander and ruler, like Theodosius I, whom some still may have remembered well, or a child guided by others.

The reign of Theodosius II was remarkable both for its internal stability, and its external success.[7] A prolonged lull in the military confrontation with the Persians, spanning Theodotus' episcopacy, ensured that the court was less likely to pass through Ancyra.[8] The Eastern Empire was also not being troubled by 'barbarians' in the first quarter of the fifth century.[9] However, many later accounts of this period, like the church histories, are tinged with a sense of uncertainty prompted by the problems with the invasions, especially by the Huns under Attila in the 440s.[10]

Theodotus and his Ancyran audience had little direct contact with the inner workings of the elaborate and rich imperial court, which remained mainly in Constantinople,[11] and seldom moved eastwards for extended periods. The geographical, administrative, and military coherence of the empire was partially

[4] N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 37, 50, J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 23-6, K.G. Holum, *Theodosian Empresses* (1982), 79ff., K. Cooper, 'Empress and Theotokos' (2004), *ead.*, 'Contesting the Nativity' (1998), V. Limberis, *Divine Heiress* (1994), 41ff.

[5] Cyril was reprimanded by the emperor (ACO I 1/1, 73, 22 - 74, 3) for writing to the empresses and princesses (*Pulch.*: ACO I 1/5, 26-61). See also C. Kelly (ed.), *Theodosius II* (2013).

[6] Only in 457 a Christian element was incorporated in the proclamation of a new ruler with the coronation by the patriarch of Constantinople, see J. Herrin, *Byzantium* (2008), 30.

[7] F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), 41.

[8] The court, however, was aware that the Sassanid Empire under Bahram V (420-438), since the inconclusive war of 420-2, was considerably strong and stable. It has been suggested that these concerns partially influenced the Roman efforts to avoid an estrangement of the Oriental dioceses, as well as of other regions bordering Persia. See T. Graumann, 'Kirchliche Identität und bischöfliche Selbstinszenierung' (2003), 199.

[9] Theodotus praises the imperial victory over βάρβαροι as an accomplished feat. See *Exp. symb.*, PG77, 1313C.

[10] D. Rohrbacher, *The Historians of Late Antiquity* (2002), 115-6.

[11] Ancyra had profited especially from Arcadius' regular early summer journeying through western Anatolia, see C. Foss, 'Late antique and Byzantine Ankara' (1977), 50.

ensured by keeping a good infrastructure of roads, on which travel was not unduly hampered. The relative ease of travel meant that those who could afford it might journey for leisure, education, and private interests. Members of the army and of the state administration would often be travelling, assigned to new posts. Letters were regularly exchanged, and the state had ways to ensure a relatively efficient communication system, although citizens had still to rely on people they could trust with carrying a letter.[12] Even so, distance and geographical separation were often mentioned as obstacles to communication.[13]

Theodosius II was the judge to whom all, poor or rich, could appeal. Only the emperor legislated,[14] albeit aided and influenced by his advisors, the court and the senate. The legislation with which people worked, and to which they were used, were the imperial constitutions, laws, letters, and rescripts, in all their plurality and particularity. Legal decisions very often relied on finding a relevant precedent. Although Theodosius II had announced in 429 the beginning of the work on what became the Theodosian Code, nothing was issued before 435.[15] Many members of the imperial administration who were connected with this great legal project were also involved in conciliar events.[16]

The ongoing development of the bureaucratic aristocracy was an important part of the social changes in the cities, affecting a substantial contingent of the usual audience a bishop would have in the main church(es) of the capital of his diocese. The imperially paid administration operated mostly without direct control from the court, which occasionally attempted to refrain or reform it. Taxes based on ongoing census of the population and evaluation of land, property and people paid the maintenance of both the central and peripheral bureaucracy – largely placed in the cities across the empire, it provided the control of the empire –, and of the army – perhaps three hundred thousand strong, it dealt with the security of the empire, usually along the frontier, and also with innumerable local problems.[17]

Members of the aristocracy and of the administration in general were well educated, literate, and often bilingual.[18] In the fifth century, use and knowledge

[12] B. Neil *et al.* (eds), *Preaching Poverty* (2009), 46, and P. Allen, 'Prolegomena to a study of the letter-bearer' (2013).

[13] The classical study is J. Nicholson, 'The delivery and confidentiality of Cicero's letters' (1994).

[14] C. Humfress, *Orthodoxy and the Courts* (2007), 65; D. Caramboula, 'Die Reichsidee zur Zeit Diokletians' (2007), 283; M. Kaser, *Das römische Privatrecht* (1959).

[15] *Sacra* (imperial letter) of 26 March 429: *Codex Theodosianum* 1.1.5.

[16] For example, Antiochus was a member of both commissions on the Theodosian Code (*CTh* I 1.5-6), and a regular correspondent of several Orientals, including Nestorius and John of Antioch who express confidence on his ability to influence the court on their behalf, for example, ACO I 1/7, 71, ACO I 4, 64.

[17] F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), 14-5, C. Kelly, *Ruling the Later Roman Empire* (2004), 109-20, J. Herrin, *Byzantium* (2008), 30-2.

[18] C. Kelly, *Ruling the Later Roman Empire* (2004), 112.

of Latin in the Eastern Empire was already retreating. Greek had remained the *lingua franca* of all eastern regions throughout the empire, even at court. Theodosius II apparently discussed in Greek with bishops and religious dignitaries on the Nestorian controversy.[19] Nevertheless, until the sixth century, the administration of the empire still employed Latin, at least in internal communications between officials. The technical vocabulary in executive, juridical and military matters was Latin, or derived from it. Those who were educated with the prospect of pursuing a career in imperial administration, or who could become involved with it, would generally learn Latin.[20] Theodotus seems to have had some knowledge of Latin, and how official communication was handled in the Empire.[21] The bishops assembled in the fifth-century councils in the East, representative of a wide range of backgrounds, show that Latin was not current, since they were not expected to be fluent,[22] although most were considered 'educated men' to some degree.[23] The administration also used Greek regularly, since it generally addressed the population in it. Knowledge of Greek was expected from bishops taking part in imperially summoned councils. Greek was also used in internal letters between low ranking members of the administration.

Throughout the Empire, many other languages were spoken and coexisted with the Greek used, for example, by urban elites. In many areas, bishops knew that when they spoke in Greek, they were probably not understood by a large contingent of non-Greek-speaking Christians.[24] With the rise of writing in other languages in the East, scriptures, the liturgy and important theological works were being continually translated, for example, into Syriac.[25] Few authors, however, wrote in more than one language.[26]

[19] F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), 205-7. See also R. Cribiore, *The School of Libanius* (2007), 208-12 for an analysis of the evidence of widespread lack of fluency in Latin in the East, also at the imperial court.

[20] C. Humfress, *Orthodoxy and the Courts* (2007), 4, 69ff. According to A. Cameron, 'Vergil illustrated between Pagans and Christians' (2004), 502ff. at least in Constantinople the learning of Latin and Latin literature and culture could go quite far, and be part of the broader education available especially to the wealthy. See also F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), 20.

[21] Indicated by his communication with the Roman legates during the 16-7 July conciliar sessions and a digression on language and writing in Homily II (ACO I 1/2, 79, 31-80, 29). However, the plausibility of Theodotus' knowledge of Latin is rejected and used to question the authorship of *Hom. i. s. Deiparam* in G.L. Castro, *Teodoto di Ancira* (1992), 6. While the authenticity can be ruled out on weightier grounds, Theodotus' command of Latin remains a valid hypothesis.

[22] See F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), especially 20-4, 84-5.

[23] Few rejected all sort of worldly learning to the point of being illiterate.

[24] A.M. Crabbe, 'The invitation list' (1981), 387-8.

[25] A.H. Becker, *Fear of God and the Beginning of Wisdom* (2006), 17, N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 93.

[26] See, for example, S.P. Brock, *From Ephrem to Romanos* (1999), 153ff., and F. Biville, 'The Graeco-Romans and Graeco-Latin' (2002).

The church

Theodotus spoke of the 'holy church of Christ Jesus',[27] of which he was a member and in which he officiated as metropolitan bishop. It was the 'Theodosian imperial' church, where state and religion were not kept apart and imperial rulings on the ecclesiastic offices gave clergy some rights and privileges, but also limits and duties. Like office-holders of the imperial administration, even metropolitans were expected to obey imperial legislation and any 'higher' ranking official. It was the 'Nicene' Church, where Christians claimed to hold the faith of the fathers of Nicaea (325), and to follow the decisions, on doctrinal or ecclesiastical matters, which the synods and councils they recognised had reached.[28]

As bishop, Theodotus' responsibilities spanned from his seat to remote areas. A bishopric could include hundreds of villages scattered around the city,[29] which the bishop might visit for certain occasions or problems, like the 'orthodoxy' of belief. In Ancyra and especially when going out to villages in rural and remote areas Theodotus would have faced the practice of traditional customs, that still motivated calls for conversion and missionary activity.[30] However, his references to unbelief and Hellenism[31] ought to be placed in the context of the invectives against paganism, and the arguments developed, for example, in the works against Julian. Theodotus would have been aided by others, like scribes, and presbyters or chorepiscopi leading the churches most villages had.

Bishops also had to deal with urban government structures, especially of their see. Cities were largely self-governing but there were various communication channels with the imperial power, in which bishops often excelled,[32] since the exercise of their religious duties entailed considerable respect and influence. Distinguished religious leaders could circumvent the formal structure of the empire relying on their spiritual authority and power.[33]

It is difficult to infer from Theodotus' actions and writings facts concerning his career and background. There was no clear career path in the church, nor formalised training and education for the exercise of the functions associated with a certain position. Generalisations are problematic, in view of varying

[27] Homily VI.5, B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 132, 6.

[28] ACO I 1/2, 14, 13. On the late antique characteristics of the 'Bischofskirche', see H.R. Seeliger, 'Die Erforschung der spätantiken Bischofssitze' (2011), 195-7. See also T. Graumann, 'Protokollierung, Aktenerstellung' (2010), 28, A. Weckwerth, *Ablauf, Organisation und Selbstverständnis westlicher antiker Synoden* (2007), 7.

[29] R.V. Dam, 'Bishops and clerics' (2011), 223.

[30] E. Wipszycka, *Études sur le christianisme dans l'Égypte* (1996), 87.

[31] *E.g.* ACO I 1/2, 86, 2; 87, 17.

[32] F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), 26-7.

[33] C. Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity* (2005), 156ff. P. Brown, *Power and Persuasion* (1992), 11ff., 140ff.

customs, influenced by local traditions. The pattern of progressing from reader or deacon, via presbyter, to bishop,[34] was common, but other backgrounds were also well accepted, especially when links to monasticism existed. Like many bishops, Theodotus displayed some familiarity with forensic expertise,[35] which was 'a stepping-stone to advancement in an imperial church'.[36]

Dioceses covered all the Empire but episcopal and secular dioceses did not correspond exactly. The incongruities did not reawaken memories of the division of the provinces in the Diocletianic and Constantinian reforms, rather, by the early fifth century, the regional geography of imperial power was widely seen as a settled world image. Beyond the level of province and metropolis, parallels with the secular structure are inexact. Spheres of influence of metropolises, and a hierarchy between the bishoprics under one metropolitan were crystallising.[37] The unspecified boundaries and the fluid structure opened room for significant disputes, often relying on disciplinary or doctrinal accusations, many of which based on vague claims.[38]

A metropolitan bishop was involved in consecrations of subordinate bishops, in dealing with their complaints, and was expected to call provincial synods.[39] Ancyra and neighbouring metropolises were not particularly linked to any other

[34] C. Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity* (2005), 152, 201-2; P. Norton, *Episcopal Elections* (2007), 46-51, 62-3 seems as much as can be said about the background of the candidates. The unsuitability of laymen without prolonged ecclesiastic career is the main emphasis of the available sources, *e.g.* Serdica, canon 10. In the election process, only the *testimonium* can suggest prior links between the candidate and the city (*e.g.*, a deacon by administrative and charitable functions, a presbyter by the liturgical role in the smaller churches of the city), and P. Norton, *Episcopal Elections* (2007), 26, 37, 62-3, is cautious of its importance. In larger cities, deacons were very suitable candidates, for their familiarity with the often large property and wealth of the see (*ibid.*, 212). Foreigners were often appointed, see *ibid.*, 109 and the examples in P. Allen, 'Episcopal succession in Antioch' (2011). See also, R.V. Dam, 'Bishops and clerics' (2011), 235ff.

[35] See p. 79.

[36] See C. Humfress, *Orthodoxy and the Courts* (2007), 144. Despite the arguments in *ibid.*, 111, 153ff., Theodotus may exemplify bishops who had received some 'formal' education in rhetoric prior to their ordination and during their career in the church acquired necessary legal expertise.

[37] See F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), 24-5, 134. Also, P. Norton, *Episcopal Elections* (2007), 119ff., 141, R.V. Dam, 'Bishops and clerics' (2011), 221, for the limitations of the parallel. For the secular importance of bishops, see also C. Rapp, 'The elite status of bishops' (2000).

[38] *E.g.* involving Constantinople: Photius, *Bibliotheca* 59.19a15-6 (Synod of the Oak), R. Henry (ed.), *Photius. Bibliothèque I* (1959), 56 – *cf.* S. Elm, 'The dog that did not bark' (1998), 74-5; Charisius Philadelphenus *libell.*: ACO I 1/7, 96, 19-97, 24 (22 July 431) – *cf.* J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 100, R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon* (2005) I, 21, T. Graumann, 'Protokollierung, Aktenerstellung' (2010), 26, 33, and especially the interpretation in L. Abramovski, 'Die Sitzung des Konzils von Ephesus am 22. Juli 431' (2004), 387ff., to be paralleled with N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 92ff. See P.V. Nuffelen, 'The rhetoric of rules' (2011).

[39] F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), 24-5, 134-5.

see, nor yet strictly under the sphere of influence of any emerging 'patriarchate'.[40] The choice and consecration of bishops increasingly followed synodical canons. In numerous sources, the bishops who were involved are recorded, and even if a comprehensive assessment is impossible since the evidence for most regions is scarce and unsystematic, it is used to analyse the patterns of influence and the fifth-century church political developments. Ancyra, for example, gradually lost to Constantinople the control in the consecration of bishops of many dioceses.[41]

The early fifth century was a period of sedimentation and development for Christianity. Local differences continued to appear and flourish, and could find support in regional synods. There was no single authoritative source of norms for religious practices and beliefs to which to turn.[42] Episcopal sees, especially the main metropolitan sees, operated independently. When problems related to another see were brought to a metropolitan's attention, he was expected to contact the other bishop, and if necessary to refer to equally or higher ranking bishops, as was the practice of the Roman administration of referring to a superior instance. The church assumed that collective judgement, in the form of synodical decisions, had greater authority and metropolitan bishops were expected to organise regional synods regularly. Outstanding or lingering problems, or tensions between metropolitan sees were addressed in extraordinary synods. After Constantine convened Nicaea, it was not rare to refer disciplinary and doctrinal conflicts stretching over boundaries of diocesan jurisdiction to the emperor(s). When summoning councils, emperors facilitated the process, providing, for example, travel coverage,[43] accommodation expenses and administrative personnel for the sessions. The Council of Nicaea set a pattern of imperial convocation, attendance, participation and even direct intervention.

The Emperor Theodosius II was, like his predecessors, looking for the church to offer him a unified faith and population, which would favour the prospects of a more powerful empire.[44] The formal 'establishment' of a Nicene faith at the time of his grandfather, Theodosius I,[45] was not reflected in an end of the conflicts over orthodoxy. Bishops were challenged by heresies in cities and villages in their dioceses, metropolitans, by their tributary bishops. Religious and ecclesiastical problems were referred to the imperial authority. The state knew, perhaps imperceptibly, that religious differences (especially via the formation

[40] P. Norton, *Episcopal Elections* (2007), 142-4.

[41] ACO II 1/3, 88[447], 28-89[448], 17. See R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon* (2005) III, 67-73. *Cf.* P.V. Nuffelen, 'The rhetoric of rules' (2011).

[42] F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), 131.

[43] C. Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity* (2005), 237.

[44] Many bishops offered this to their emperors, epitomised by Nestorius' declaration to Theodosius II, quoted by Socrates, *H. e.* VII, 29, 4-5. See also A. Cameron and S.G. Hall (eds), *Eusebius. Life of Constantine* (1999), 42-5, 250-1.

[45] *Cunctos populos*, *CTh* XVI, 1, 2.

of a local religious identity) could contribute to the fragmentation of volatile areas, especially frontier regions. The readiness to fight and die for the faith which Theodotus expressed in his homilies[46] reflected the importance of martyrdom. The saints from the Roman persecutions were venerated, and it was still a palpable concept, especially near Persia, since Christianity was persecuted there.[47] Readiness to become a martyr for the right beliefs was a disposition which could still be fulfilled in an empire where the Christian rulers' orthodoxy, as official religion, had often changed considerably throughout the fourth century, and where violence was used against those labelled as heretics.

Bishops usually split into two opposing parties on most disputed matters and the allegiances were often informed by the wider context. At synods and councils, the sitting order could reflect the factions.[48] The imperial administration seemed to ignore, perhaps deliberately, most finesses of ecclesiastical hierarchy and church political disputes.[49] Nevertheless, Theodosius II was aware of the tendency to polarisation between the bishops. When he summoned an ecumenical council in November 430, he asked for dialogue not only between the individuals at the source of the conflict, but also the larger groups which could form.[50]

The reputation of the Council of Nicaea was clouded in imprecision, resulting in part from the lack of 'standard' documentation about it. Without living eye-witnesses, by the early fifth century there was a widely shared picture of what was likely to have happened. In all areas the bishops probably had access at least to the Nicene creed and to texts on the condemnation of Arius, on Easter and the canons.[51] Included in imperial letters, they were likely to have been widely circulated and promulgated, as laws valid in the oikoumene of the Roman empire.[52] In some regions other sources were available, like the letters sent by bishops taking part in the council, such as Eusebius of Cæsarea,[53] to their dioceses.[54] Some of the reports and documents with which the fifth-century church historians built their narrative[55] contributed to the imagination about Nicaea of the bishops who went to Ephesus in 431, but not homogeneously. The 'Nicene' faith, which all purported not to alter, was not rigidly defined.

[46] *E.g.* B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 132.

[47] The persecution there started more or less when Christianity began to be tolerated in the Roman Empire. See Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *H. e.*, V, on persecution in Persia around 420.

[48] R. MacMullen, *Voting about God* (2006), 195. *E.g.* ACO II 1/1, 115, 20-34.

[49] See below (p. 56) the remarks on the list of invitees, and on the *sacra* to the council via John, *comes largitionum*, of 431 (see p. 81).

[50] ACO I 1/1, 115, 19-20.

[51] J. Herrin, *Byzantium* (2008), 36.

[52] L. Abramowski, 'Der Bischof von Seleukia-Ktesiphon' (2011), 17.

[53] *Ep. Caes.*, H.-G. Opitz (ed.), *Athanasius Werke* (1935), 28-31.

[54] Evidence for episcopal archives in the early fifth century is scarce, see A. Weckwerth, *Ablauf, Organisation und Selbstverständnis westlicher antiker Synoden* (2007), 36.

[55] Socrates, *H. e.* I, 8, Sozomen *H. e.* I, 17.

Theological declarations were still formulated in the form of credal formulae, but bishops increasingly expressed reticence to issue new creeds at synods.[56]

Regional synods were valuable occasions for networking and were held frequently. Accordingly, the bishops invited to Ephesus were familiar with the 'format',[57] and were also aware of differences, such as the imperial involvement and the scope of what was to happen there. Bishops with various backgrounds and diverse experiences met at regional synods, and the patterns of alliance were not stable.[58] Several fourth and fifth-century examples suggest that procedural minutes or stenographic records of the discussions were often taken, at least when imperial officers participated.[59] Minutes or records of some of the sessions of the Council of Ephesus are extant, and contain references to the taking of minutes and attachment of documents.[60] In general, the minutes did not circulate widely, and contain no self-referential realisation of preserving the actions of bishops for history. Some bishops and theologians in Ephesus, or concerned with related events, may have been aware of theological discussions under imperial auspices which had not been enforced, or had been little effective.[61] Many knew, often from first-hand experience, of synods which had developed very differently from the idealised model of Nicaea.[62] The events involving John Chrysostom, which led to his death were recent and their influence was compounded by the numerous ceremonies related to the restoration of his memory, which happened shortly before the Nestorian crisis.[63] He was a major example for the characterisation of 'holy men' in

[56] On the fluid distinction of creeds and credal formulae, see, for example, W. Kinzig *et al.*, *Tauffragen und Bekenntnis* (1999), L.H. Westra, *The Apostles' Creed* (2002). Even if this recent scholarship focuses on the first three centuries, it supports translating πίστις in expressions referring to the πίστις of Nicaea or of the Nicene fathers not only as 'creed' (*cf.* ACO I 1/2, 12, 29), but also as 'faith', to reflect the range of interpretative and synodical aspects contained in the reference to patristic authority. The session of 22 July 431 (ACO I 1/7, 105, 20ff) and Theodotus *Exp. symb.* attest the fifth-century development and establishment of an authoritative creed. See also S. Gerber, *Theodor von Mopsuestia und das Nicänum* (2000), 267-71.

[57] A. Weckwerth, *Ablauf, Organisation und Selbstverständnis westlicher antiker Synoden* (2007).

[58] For example, Acacius of Beroea and other older Oriental bishops had attended synods where they were on the same side of Roman and other Western representatives, a co-operation which was not going to repeat itself in Ephesus in the summer of 431.

[59] H. Hess, *The Early Development of Canon Law* (2002), 60-2.

[60] ACO I 1/2, 31, 10; 38, 33-4.

[61] For example, the selective reception of the Council of Constantinople (381). At least in Egypt, most canons and the creed were seldom mentioned until the status of council and creed alike were recognised at Chalcedon in 451 (ACO II 5, 22, 18). See E. Schwartz, 'Cyrill und der Mönch Viktor' (1926), 83f., and E. K. Chrysos, 'Die Akten des Konzils von Konstantinopel I (381)' (1982), 426-8.

[62] Eusebius *V. C.* 3, 8-27, F. Winkelmann (ed.), *Eusebius Werke: 1. Bd., 1. T.* (1975), 85-96.

[63] See N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 114-5, also on the influence of Chrysostom's preaching in Antioch and in Constantinople, of which there were still plenty of eye witnesses in 431.

ecclesiastical office.[64] It is likely that the court and the Cyrillians attempted to act and present their deeds so as to minimise the rise of parallels between Nestorius and Chrysostom. Nestorius' own later writing, and those of his supporters tend to emphasise characteristics he held in common with other bishops with monastic background facing adverse conditions, especially John Chrysostom, also bishop of Constantinople.[65]

The debate which largely occupied the bishops at the Council of Ephesus was about Christology. It developed from fourth-century theological disputes, especially on Trinitarian arguments within Christianity. The gradual and organic change of ideas makes it difficult to identify and separate factions and ascribe beliefs to them. Nevertheless, the arguments about theological concepts were often formulated in terms of orthodoxy and heresy, with claims of upholding the right faith and accusations of deviating from it.[66] The Nestorian controversy seems to have sprung from the attempts to tackle remaining Arian and Apollinarian heretical problems, whose real extent and vigour it is hard to judge.[67] Their presence is often inferred from texts, such as homilies and pastoral letters, which name heresies present among the audience, whether lay, monastic or ecclesiastic. Rhetorical references to the heresies or other condemnable groups are hard to distinguish from signs of actual involvement of the congregation with the beliefs ascribed to those deviations.[68] As discussed below,[69] a pedagogical and catechetical purposes of these references was to enlighten furtively the listeners that they were holding ideas which actually belonged to the heresies being named, or which the preacher attributed to them.

There was no well developed understanding of Christology yet. Most bishops and theologians expressed confidence that, relying on scripture and the teachings of the church fathers,[70] they had enough elements to hold an orthodox understanding of the 'incarnation of Christ, and what it implies about the divinity and humanity of the incarnate one'.[71] They expressed this in the terms and

[64] Cited as such by Celestine in his letter to the clergy and people of Constantinople (ACO I 1/1, 84, 28-32). See C. Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity* (2005), A. Sterk, *Renouncing the World yet Leading the Church* (2004), 141ff. P. Brown, *Power and Persuasion* (1992).

[65] See the extensive references in N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 47.

[66] T. Graumann, 'Kirchliche Identität und bischöfliche Selbstinszenierung' (2003), 198.

[67] L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 48-9. *Cf.* S. Wessel, 'Nestorius, Mary and controversy' (1999), 12ff.

[68] Most early fifth-century examples probably served both purposes. Indeed, an 'orthodox' preacher was unlikely to speak, or have his homilies or letters read out in the context of a liturgical celebration in churches belonging to groups he considered heretical, such as the 'chapel used by Arians' in Constantinople, mentioned in Socrates *H. e.* VII, 29. Likewise, it is implausible that a preacher would speak of ideas he opposed to a congregation which was not aware of them.

[69] See p. 104.

[70] *Cf. e.g.* M. Laird, *Gregory of Nyssa and the Grasp of Faith* (2004), 195, M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 241.

[71] T. Graumann, 'Kirchliche Identität und bischöfliche Selbstinszenierung' (2003), 198.

ways to which they were used, considering them adequate, until a relevant technical language developed.[72]

The views of theologians were influenced by the intellectual tradition in which they had grown up, and by the problems they identified in ideas espoused by others. With hindsight, their attempts to make explicit, to attack and to counter the doctrinal issues seem influenced 'dialectically', however, the events precluded any proper dialogue for a long time. During the Nestorian controversy, Cyril's Christological ideas or at least his vocabulary developed and crystallised in reaction to what Nestorius and some Oriental bishops espoused, and vice versa.[73]

The references to Mary in Theodotus' homilies and conciliar statements are part of the significant number of fourth and early fifth-century allusions to the evolving Marian traditions[74] which corroborate the importance of Marian devotion but also the absence of a fully fledged veneration prior to the Council of Ephesus. The Nestorian controversy sharpened the separation of different theological traditions. Data from just a few decades after the Council of Ephesus on intense Marian devotion with widespread common elements can hardly be applied retroactively,[75] nor should prominent local endeavours[76] be regarded as widely known and appreciated.[77] The Cyrillian Council validated and recommended the expression 'Mary *Theotokos*', contributing to its increased use, both in slogans and elaborate theological discussions.

Some trends of 'popular' Marian devotion were recognised by the Orientals, other were encouraged by the Cyrillian bishops, and some received imperial

[72] 'Greek Christians of the late antique period had a highly ambivalent relationship with their language. While they relied on it in their quest for an unequivocal definition of the Christian faith, they were at the same time only too aware of its slipperiness, which made it all but impossible to control the meanings of words. [...] The Christological controversies [...] focused on a [...] term which alone seemed to guarantee the required absence of ambiguity, the Θεοτόκος title for Mary.' D. Krausmüller, 'Theotokos-diadochos' (2006), 35.

[73] See T. Graumann, 'Towards the reception of the Council of Ephesus' (2010), 171, the introductions to N. Russell, *Cyril* (2000) and T.G. Weinandy and D.A. Keating (eds), *The Theology of St. Cyril* (2003), as well as C.A. Beeley, 'Cyril of Alexandria and Gregory Nazianzen' (2009) for a discussion of the strongly polarised scholarship and its causes.

[74] G. Söll, *Mariologie* (1978), 50-73. Some non-scriptural details, such as the preservation of Mary's virginity at Christ's birth, were probably accepted widely enough for Theodotus to use them as syllogistic premisses, *cf.* ACO I 1/2, 75, 12.

[75] L.F. Mateo-Seco, 'Der Titel "Gottesmutter"' (2004), J. Herrin, *Byzantium* (2008), 54-5, M. Fassler, 'The first Marian feast' (2001), 28, V. Limberis, *Divine Heiress* (1994), 145.

[76] For example, the patronage of Marian devotion by the women of the imperial household, see N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 38ff., and K. Cooper, 'Empress and Theotokos' (2004), 31-41, 51 reappraising some scholarly debate, *e.g.* K.G. Holum, *Theodosian Empresses* (1982), 144ff., V. Limberis, *Divine Heiress* (1994), 53, K. Cooper, 'Contesting the Nativity' (1998); *cf.* R. Price, 'Marian piety and the Nestorian controversy' (2004), 36f., S. Wessel, 'Nestorius, Mary and controversy' (1999), 9ff.

[77] See p. 18.

support.[78] Christian devotions and religious practices often had a long development before they are first registered in extant literary texts.[79] Allusions to such 'popular beliefs' could help a preacher to procure the benevolence of his audience, and secure their attention and regular attendance, opposing the competition from other sources of entertainment or theological instruction.[80] Bishops, who incorporated devotions, sometimes provided explanations or interpretations. They were often a source of new input to dogmatic questions to which theologians did not necessarily react favourably. Some bishops tried to counter religious practices with normative actions, or to enlighten their audiences as to the inappropriateness of their doings. Attempts to curb devotions could lead to dissatisfaction, and occasional challenges ranged from direct questions to complaints to superior instances. For example, Nestorius approached the problems he spotted in the beliefs held by his audience by highlighting the shortcomings of their views, discussing and comparing details, and his endeavours left him, often described as a tactless preacher, exposed to attacks.[81]

Ancyra

Information about Ancyra in the fifth century is rather fragmentary.[82] The literary and archeological evidence for the third and fourth centuries is more extensive and allows a vivid depiction of the social and religious environment of Ancyra in the generations before Theodotus.[83] Some of this was part of the milieu or of the collective memory with which Theodotus dealt. Inferences about the province and the city in his time demand discretion.

The province of Galatia had a hard climate, and was sparsely populated. Sheep and goats thrived allowing for textile production and the manufacture of dyes, probably centred in Ancyra. During the fourth century the province was an important source of Gothic slaves and the traffic had brought some wealth. Its

[78] See J. Baun, *Tales from another Byzantium* (2007), 78-9, V. Limberis, *Divine Heiress* (1994), 145-7.

[79] *E.g.* devotional formulas as in John Rylands Library Pap. 470, C.H. Roberts (ed.), *Theological and Literary Texts* (1938), 36ff., H. Förster, 'Die älteste marianische Antiphon' (2005), 107, developed from earlier traditions registered, for example, in apocrypha, *cf.* S.J. Shoemaker, 'Between scripture and tradition' (2008), *id.*, *Ancient Traditions of the Virgin Mary's Dormition* (2006), 17, 34ff., 152ff., 288.

[80] J.LR. Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication* (2006).

[81] See L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 30ff. as well as N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 49ff. Nestorius' downfall can be taken to represent the limit of influence and success a holy man in the making could have early in the fifth century in the imperial capital, facing incompatible traditional aspects of the court of the Roman Empire.

[82] C. Foss, 'Late antique and Byzantine Ankara' (1977) provides an useful survey of the extant documents, archaeological evidence and ancient 'secondary literature'.

[83] S. Mitchell, *Anatolia* (1995), *id.*, 'The life of saint Theodotus' (1982).

significant grain production[84] exceeded internal needs and allowed it to participate in the most reliable market of late antiquity to some extent.[85] Theodotus may have profited of the richness of Ancyra by coming from a wealthy family,[86] or by the lands and property owned or administered by the diocese, which would be under his control.[87] Alexandria illustrates late antique wealthy dioceses, as well as metropolitan bishops coming from leading Christian families of a well-established and powerful regional aristocracy.[88] Cyril's network of informants and bribery is also the paradigm of a bishop using wealth for his own interests.[89]

In the fourth century, Ancyra had been 'a military and administrative center, an imperial resort, a place with a highly literate upper class, and a zealous Christian community dominated by influential bishops.'[90] Libanius refers many times to Ancyra.[91] The city did not equal Athens, Antioch or Alexandria in pagan or Christian tradition. It was only regionally famous and did not figure among the wealthiest cities in the Eastern Roman Empire. Secular historical accounts on the fifth century are generally lacking.[92] The sources suggest that the city kept its cultural liveliness and richness in the following decades, rivalling other cities of similar economical and political significance. Theodotus' writings composed in good Greek and with elaborate rhetorical, stylistic and argumentative techniques would have suited the ears of his Ancyran audience, as much as of conciliar bishops and the court.

Most information for the early fifth century stems from the works of Palladius and Nilus.[93] Their accounts revolve around holy men, monks, religious and moral

[84] C. Foss, 'Late antique and Byzantine Ankara' (1977), 30-1.

[85] *E.g.* the lasting policy of providing bread for the Roman citizens. J. Herrin, *Byzantium* (2008), 26.

[86] Theodotus' elocution suggests a classical education, which usually only rich families could afford. The importance of wealth for the election of bishops is much debated, since the evidence is unclear and ambiguous. See P. Norton, *Episcopal Elections* (2007), 183 on the provenance of the money for post-elections payments at the time of Justinian.

[87] E. Wipszycka, *Études sur le christianisme dans l'Égypte* (1996), 159; H.R. Seeliger, 'Die Erforschung der spätantiken Bischofssitze' (2011), 196-7. *Cf.* ACO I 1/2, 13, 19-23.

[88] See C.D.G. Müller, 'Alexandrien' (1978), 256. See also C. Haas, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity* (2006), 220-3, P. Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople, 451-491* (2006), 97, E. Wipszycka, *Études sur le christianisme dans l'Égypte* (1996), 157-9, and J. McKenzie, *The Architecture of Alexandria* (2007), 173, 249.

[89] Colourfully discussed in R. MacMullen, *Voting about God* (2006), 67, especially note 31. See further P. Batiffol, 'Les présents de saint Cyrille' (1919), T. Graumann, 'Kirchliche Identität und bischöfliche Selbstinszenierung' (2003), 209.

[90] C. Foss, 'Late antique and Byzantine Ankara' (1977), 51.

[91] See C. Foss, 'Late antique and Byzantine Ankara' (1977), 42-9 for an overview of the relevant passages, and R. Cribiore, *The School of Libanius* (2007), 71-2.

[92] See S. Mitchell, *A History of the Later Roman Empire* (2007), 102.

[93] Palladius was bishop of Helenopolis, perhaps Aspuna, south of Ancyra, on the great highway, but had died before 431. Nilus lived until the mid-fifth century. See D. Brakke, *Demons and the Making of the Monk* (2006), 134-7.

issues, lending Ancyra a reputation as centre of piety and charity. Palladius wrote the *Historia Lausiaca* in 420, a time when Theodotus probably was already in Ancyra, perhaps as bishop. Both Palladius and Nilus were Galatian supporters of John Chrysostom, perchance his disciples. They were monks, and travelled much, Palladius to Egypt and Palestine, and Nilus to Constantinople. They give evidence of monasteries, hermits, virgins, monks who sometimes settled elsewhere, including near Antioch, several instances of '[p]ilgrimages to the Holy Land and to Egypt to visit the famous monks'[94] by Galatians. It is not a comprehensive representation of the society, and their perspective limits the historical reliability of the numbers and of the picture they provide of Ancyra in the first two decades of the fifth century. Their accounts do not rule out the continuity of many facets which Libanius had described.[95]

Specific information about monasticism in Ancyra during Theodotus' life is not abundant and works such as Palladius' and Nilus' are not reliable sources.[96] Regional differences in monastic practices and traditions are characteristic for this time.[97] Monasticism had developed speedily since the period of the Tetrarchy to become a well established, but multi-faceted, aspect of Christian religious life. It influenced the perception of religious authority, theological language and literary genres. Works on venerated monks and ascetics spread their ideals quickly and widely. Monks claimed their way of life helped to a truer knowledge of Christ.[98] In the East, bishops came increasingly from among monks or hermits, and it became the favoured career pattern in Byzantium.[99] During the early fifth century, the church was experimenting with ways to explore, influence and control the extremely varied forms of asceticism. Gradually, the relation of power between a bishop and the monks in his diocese was specified, and the organisation and running of monasteries was regulated.[100]

It is unlikely that Theodotus led a monastic life as bishop. Nonetheless, a later anti-Nestorian source[101] calls Theodotus a brother, associated with ascetic

[94] C. Foss, 'Late antique and Byzantine Ankara' (1977), 53.

[95] *Ibid.*, 49.

[96] See, however, S. Mitchell, *Anatolia* (1995), II, 114, interpreting the evidence of 2,000 *parthenoi* led by Magna.

[97] See also F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), 131-2, C.B. Horn, *Asceticism and Christological Controversy* (2006), 54-5, 112ff., P. Hatlie, *The Monks and Monasteries* (2007), R.D. Finn, *Asceticism* (2009), P. Brown, *The Body and Society* (2008), J. Herrin, *Byzantium* (2008), 40-1.

[98] C. Stewart, *Cassian the Monk* (1999), 94-7. For the relation of monastic ideals and the Christological debate, see D. Fairbairn, *Grace and Christology* (2003), 133-49 and C.B. Horn, *Asceticism and Christological Controversy* (2006).

[99] A. Sterk, *Renouncing the World yet Leading the Church* (2004), 173ff.

[100] See F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), 132 on Canon 4 of Chalcedon, ACO II 1/2, 159[355], 10-23.

[101] Discussed on p. 66.

practices. Since some sources suggest a monastic background for Nestorius, Theodotus' putative earlier acquaintance with him may have come from a shared monastic experience.

In Ancyra and nearest environs, the mostly imprecise late antique sources mention a cathedral church and some seven churches or chapels and six other possible venues for Christian worship which may have stood in Theodotus' time.[102] Many religious buildings were probably small, particularly those described as chapels or abodes of venerable individuals. Nevertheless, they add up to a significant number of relevant religious sites, considering the size of Ancyra. In a smaller scale, it was similar to Ephesus.[103] Both cities had suffered extensive damage in the late third century – either from Gothic invasion[104] or earthquake – but had recovered economically and socially. The building of churches in particular had increased quantitative and qualitatively and reached a new level with the Theodosian religious edicts. In so far as the erection of churches and other Christian buildings occupied sites or reused building materials, it is likely that most were sites left derelict from the late third century, including dilapidated public buildings.[105]

Except for Christian buildings, the urban landscape of Ancyra changed little in the fourth and fifth century. After most of the city had been repaired or rebuilt,[106] construction of non-religious public buildings stagnated. It can be explained by the security of the city and the absence of destruction or damage to buildings, most of which were new, but it was probably compounded by a redirection of private wealth, linked to the Christianisation of the empire, or a decline in the economy or in the significance of the city. The chronology of the building activity makes it possible that Theodotus had been directly involved with its recent surge, or at least with the inaugurations and associated celebrations.

In Ancyra, several theatres were in use.[107] Their attendance only declined after Theodotus' generation, when they sustained damage in various incursions.[108] He had perhaps to contend with the theaters for the attention of his audience, which may have encouraged him to acquire a confident use of dramatisation.[109]

[102] C. Foss, 'Late antique and Byzantine Ankara' (1977), 60ff.

[103] S. Ladstätter and A. Pülz, 'Ephesus' (2007), 413ff.

[104] In Ephesus most of the damage, even related to fires, was due to earthquakes and not to the Goths, but even there the limited sacking and plundering of the countryside severely affected the city, with long-lasting economical consequences, *cf. ibid.*, 396.

[105] See J.-P. Caillet, 'La transformation en église d'édifices publics et de temples' (1996), 201-2.

[106] C. Foss, 'Late antique and Byzantine Ankara' (1977), 60ff. comprises also important civic buildings.

[107] *Ibid.*, 60ff.

[108] See the evidence discussed in C. Foss, *ibid.*, 60, L. Lavan, 'What killed the ancient city?' (2009), and E.J. Watts, *City and School* (2006), 81.

[109] See pp. 36, 102 also J.LR. Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication* (2006), 54, 95ff.

Theodotus probably did not have to deal with the challenge of 'competing preaching bishops'.[110]

In 314, Ancyra was the venue for an influential synod,[111] in which 'those who had lapsed [during the just ended persecutions] were received back into communion with degrees of penance which reflected the reluctance, willingness, or even enthusiasm with which they had transgressed'.[112] Accommodation and tolerance are considered characteristic of the regional character of Galatia, and exemplified by the approach to Montanism in the third and fourth centuries.[113] By 420-30, the overt plurality of Christian beliefs had been significantly curbed by a twofold systematic targeting. The church had been emphasising orthodoxy, and both the central and provincial administration tried to enforce laws against heresies. Nevertheless, a preacher had to cope with collective memory. Ancyra and its environs had been exposed to a great variety of Christian trends. There, Theodotus would have addressed some who could recall or had been part of a 'heretical church'.[114] Some might remember the mid fourth-century turbulent episcopacies of Marcellus and Basil, and their teaching, or the ideas of their supposed disciples, such as Photinus.[115]

Theodotus' episcopal predecessor was Leontius,[116] head of the 'monastery' in Ancyra, at least before his election.[117] They do not seem to have been related by any ties. The dating of most of the building activity mentioned above makes it attributable to Leontius. The evidence for monasteries and Leontius' own monastic life suggest an early establishment and significance of monasticism in Ancyra. Thus, Theodotus' audience may have been familiar with the ideas and vocabulary current in monastic environments, and possibly included monks and ascetics. In Ancyra, monks do not seem to have confronted their bishop.[118]

[110] The many large churches of Constantinople provided the setting for challenging preachers, like Proclus. See N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 56-7.

[111] S. Parvis, *Marcellus of Ancyra* (2006), 10.

[112] C. Foss, 'Late antique and Byzantine Ankara' (1977), 36.

[113] 'The remoter inland parts of Asia Minor throughout late antiquity [...] not unexpectedly preserved, as they preserve today, a strongly conservative social morality, which was reflected in their religious practices and beliefs', S. Mitchell, 'The life of saint Theodotus' (1982), 104; already Socrates (*H. e.* IV, 8), as noticed in L. Robert, 'Malédictions funéraires grecques' (1978).

[114] For example, *c.* 360 CE there was a living Montanist community in Ancyra, for which the *M. Thdot.* 1, 2 were written, see S. Mitchell, 'The life of saint Theodotus' (1982), 112.

[115] See p. 158.

[116] Sozomen *H. e.*, VI, 34.

[117] Nilus *Alb.* PG79, 703A.

[118] Monks could gather in large numbers, cause significant violence, and stir wider popular demonstrations. See examples on pp. 74, 112, also F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), 132. For a more prudent assessment of the evidence, see D. Brakke, *Demons and the Making of the Monk* (2006), 213-5.

Sozomen praises Leontius' zeal for orthodoxy by commending his successes against the Novatians by depriving them of their church,[119] which suggests that many followers were still in the region. Despite such attempts to establish orthodoxy, a putative regional tendency for toleration comes through in the absence of overt commitments to eradicate heresy by violence or mass reprisals. Unlike Nestorius, no anti-heretical claims which would affect large groups is attributed to Theodotus. Rather, even those he attacked, describe his approach to consolidate orthodoxy as revolving around his activity as a preacher and writer.[120] In Theodotus' works, he admonishes, instructs and warns of the dangers which heterodoxy presents for salvation. In the wake of Nestorius' deposition, he defended the exclusion of a few for the betterment of most.

Theodotus' links to the region and to Ancyra can only be suggested tentatively. No intervention on behalf of the city or its citizens is recorded. His homilies lack clear regional references, even in the direct addresses to his audience. Related to the location of Ancyra, there was a tradition of sending its youngsters to study in Antioch.[121] Perhaps, Theodotus received his education there, probably around the turn of the fourth century. Libanius provided abundant information about Antioch and its importance as a centre of learning.[122] A delicate balance and coexistence of approaches, including a large presence of teaching in Latin, was probably part of the Antiochene scene throughout the second half of the fourth century. Non-exclusivity on the students, often sent by their wealthy parents from afar, was also characteristic.[123] Some information from the end of Libanius' career[124] can be applied to the teaching environment in the city early in the fifth century. Libanius says that his school was then threatened by schools where a less thorough method was employed, and where Latin played a larger role. If Theodotus was sent to Antioch to receive a better education, and could afford to join the best schools of rhetoric, he may have obtained a good training in Latin, or at least enough familiarity with it, for it to have influenced his involvement in Ephesus.[125] An Antiochene-like training is vouched for by his actions and writings, whose elocution and style is akin to what theologians who are known to have received a good education employed in their works.

Theodotus' theology does not show any significant influence of the Antiochene theological milieu, that is, of the distinguished theologians and their

[119] Sozomen *H. e.*, VIII, 1.

[120] ACO I 4, 80, 3-5.

[121] C. Foss, 'Late antique and Byzantine Ankara' (1977), 48.

[122] *E.g.*, John Chrysostom and Basil frequented his school. Despite the chronology, they and late antique historiographers counted Theodore of Mopsuestia among Libanius' students.

[123] E.J. Watts, *City and School* (2006), 57-8. Students could attend several schools, despite ostensive affiliation rituals, see N.B. McLynn, *Christian Politics* (2009) XII, 34-6.

[124] Libanius died in 394. See R. Cribiore, *The School of Libanius* (2007), 24, 105-7, 206-8.

[125] See pp. 46, 82, 110.

followers. It has more in common with Alexandrian ideas. However, this does not rule out an Antiochene education. Grammatical and rhetorical education was not a decisive factor in adopting philosophical or theological views.[126] Students with different beliefs and views of orthodoxy often co-existed in the traditional centres of teaching, in which pre-Christian educational models were followed and developed further.[127] Thus, while nothing is known about Theodotus' education and background, an Antiochene training, plausible from what is known about Ancyra, would explain his style and could support an early acquaintance with Antiochene theologians, perhaps even with Nestorius. This scenario remains tenable, despite Theodotus' rejection of some Antiochene Christological ideas.

Christianity and late antique communication

Theodotus worked with and contributed to the complex late antique oral and literary culture knit into the existing social and political structures. Official channels of communication were not equally effective in all regions. Many imperial letters, including those bearing on theological or ecclesiological matters, had limited impact and sometimes did not become widely known. The balance with other important means of communication was complex. Not only among literate social groups, writing could contribute significantly for the spread of ideas and news and influence Christianity. Public oral communications could reach a numerous and socially varied audience, and could disclose the content of written documents. Word-of-mouth helped to spread information, for example, by travellers, including monks. Deliberate efforts to promote or hinder the dissemination of content were vulnerable to many uncertainties and hazards.

Even if unintentionally, the church became increasingly involved in the circulation of information in written and oral form. In the absence of a formalised religious education beyond the catechumenate, religious apprenticeship largely depended of dialogue with, and listening to the teachings of senior bishops and monks.

Christian orality and preaching

Communication was essentially oral in late antiquity, since written texts were most often read aloud, and one of the main goals of education was to prepare the young men to be effective orators, for example, as part of the training for

[126] On religious education, see p. 37, and on the 'School of Antioch', see A.M. Schor, *Theodoret's People* (2011), 67ff.

[127] N.B. McLynn, *Christian Politics* (2009) XII, 30-4, J. Herrin, *Byzantium* (2008), 37, P. Gemeinhardt, *Das lateinische Christentum und die antike pagane Bildung* (2007), 391-4.

forensic advocacy.[128] Also Christian 'literature' was essentially oral. Despite reports of dialogues and disputes on Christian topics in the market square and other public places,[129] a liturgical setting and dedicated venue seem to have been preferred[130] for the oral delivery of theological or ecclesiastic works to large audiences.[131] Most texts which register this oratory have been transmitted under the heading of homilies, encompassing a great variety of texts. Some hardly seem to rely on Christian themes and vocabulary. The vast majority of homilies can be fitted in a few categories, ranging from prayer-like monologues to dialogues with the audience. In early Christianised regions, several homiletic formats had already largely crystallised, often following influential models. Other elements of late antique liturgies, like scriptural readings, singing of psalms and eucharistic celebration were used or echoed in most homilies.[132]

Although homiletics is seen as a literary genre, there are no clear boundaries of what constituted preaching.[133] In the texts it can be difficult to separate oral and written elements. Homilies were often didactic, expounding and clarifying scripture and tradition to the audience, conciliating or criticising local or individual practices with regard to the conventions of major sees, corroborating a presumed post-Constantinian normalising tendency.[134] Sermons had an essential relationship between exegesis and exhortation, based on scripture.[135] The persuasive character could prevail, sometimes using just the resources typical of didactic works.

The propriety of the speech, and the speaker's ability to relate to the audience were as important for preaching as for other forms of oral communication.[136] Sermons have largely been treated on a one-to-one basis since most of the context remains unspecified, such as the education and reaction of the audience, and even the setting. Although common, a 'Christian' location and a liturgical setting were not necessary for preaching. Central questions for the appraisal of a text in classical rhetoric, such as the adequacy of content and form and the

[128] C. Humfress, *Orthodoxy and the Courts* (2007), 13.

[129] R. Lim, 'Religious disputation and social disorder' (1995), 211, 227; G. W. Bowersock *et al.*, *Late Antiquity: a Guide to the Postclassical World* (1999), 203.

[130] R. Lim, 'Religious disputation and social disorder' (1995), 220, 230.

[131] However, exactly where and when can seldom be inferred from sporadic and very diverse evidence, see L. J. Johnson, *Worship in the Early Church* (2009).

[132] See M. Cunningham, 'Dramatic device or didactic tool?' (2003) and W. Mayer, 'John Chrysostom' (1998). The relevant topics for Theodotus' homilies are analysed in the section on p. 98ff.

[133] It would be the Christian literary genre *par excellence*, yet it kept close links and developed alongside classical rhetoric, sharing most values and characteristics. See p. 9.

[134] See *e.g.* M.B. Cunningham, 'Preaching and the community' (1990), 35 for examples of appropriation of material from widespread and popular apocrypha.

[135] A. Stewart-Sykes, *From Prophecy to Preaching* (2001), 269.

[136] M. Cunningham and P. Allen, (eds), *Preacher and Audience* (1998), P. Allen and W. Mayer, 'Computer and homily' (1993).

accessibility of the ideas, are usually unanswerable, since the sources do not characterise the implicit standards shared by the local society. The information on the rhetorical conventions taught in the famous schools is generally relevant for only a small proportion of a late antique congregation.

Authors usually strove to make their preaching accessible to all.[137] A topic of attacks against preachers was that they failed to do so. Another was the critique of not being good Christians but rather behaving like 'proud' philosophers.[138] The preacher could nevertheless elaborate his homily having in mind those who could understand the deeper meanings and allusions. A preacher was esteemed if he convinced the general audience that his overall style was good and pleasant, and was adequate to the content (and vice versa).[139] In details he could display his excellence above fellow preachers. Even if only few noticed this, their word-of-mouth reports built his reputation, while the general audience was pleased with an overall understanding and occasionally spotting some of the niceties for which he was renowned.

Extant homilies suggest that preachers largely used common vocabulary,[140] and that the 'difficult' words were usually an elaboration of well known expressions. Complex passages, for example due to a syntax which baffles modern readers, were perhaps made clear to all during the performance by non-verbal resources. Thus, most in an average audience[141] could follow the discourse. Less clear is how well they could understand the twists of arguments, or differentiate a stock argument or construction from a striking one, or notice refinements of style and content and allusions to other works. The possibility of several readings in a text, depending on connotations and hints which educated listeners might notice are not frequent in Theodotus' conciliar homilies, where the audience is treated as a uniform whole. Some techniques meant to aid understanding, such as dramatisation,[142] met with occasional incomprehension. Accusations included references to the links to other forms of entertainment,

[137] That is, all acquainted with the Christian faith. Those whose intellectual pretensions did not help them with the reading of scripture, *e.g.* those following some philosophical school, were more to blame than the preacher for their failure.

[138] P. Auksi, *Christian Plain Style* (1995), 165.

[139] Proclus of Constantinople is perhaps the best example of a 'good preacher' in the early fifth century. See J.H. Barkhuizen, 'Proclus of Constantinople: a popular preacher' (1998), *id.*, *Proclus, Bishop of Constantinople – Homilies on the Life of Christ* (2001).

[140] Considering the significant differences between regional variants and scriptural Greek, it is not possible to judge objectively how difficult the language of the fathers was for the audiences. See J.LR. Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication* (2006), 93-4.

[141] See L.R. Wickham, 'Homily 4' (1993) for inferences about the audience from Gregory of Nyssa's more elaborate arguments in *Hom. in Eccl.* Some scholars suggest the preachers were understood by few, and did nothing to change the situation, see for example, R. MacMullen, 'The preacher's audience' (1989), 508-9.

[142] For a characterisation of dramatic homilies, see M.B. Cunningham, 'Polemic and exegesis' (1999), 50 and J. Kecskeméti, 'Sévérien de Gabala' (1996).

such as the theatre, which are now accounted for by the preacher's effort to compete for audience.

The schematic presentation of orthodoxy and heresy emphasised the differences which often came from nuances of language and drew the attention of the mixed crowds to the debates and the problems of the views under attack. The conditions of delivery of sermons could affect the audience's ability to understand a preacher. Theological problems which were related to language often dealt with words with several day-to-day meanings and one or more specific theological meanings, so that complaints of 'incomprehensible vocabulary' stand for 'not comprehensible in the right way', and 'people unable to follow' can stand for 'people reasoning in wrong directions'.[143]

In his see, a bishop could expect much of his audience to share his vocabulary, especially if his congregation was fairly homogeneous ethnically and socially. He could envisage a regular audience to share a wide range of presuppositions, and hope that his discourse was understood as he meant it. Far from his diocese, or speaking to an audience where many came from quite different regions, such as would have gathered to hear sermons during a synod, not all shared and agreed on vocabulary. Clear dichotomies and strong vocabulary could help to achieve clarity in preaching and transmit a message about the preacher's faith. The condensed outline of complex theological problems, however, complicated problems in other places and times.[144]

In the East not only bishops preached, however, one of their ordinary episcopal duties was to scrutinise this clerical office.[145] The preacher was an interpreter of the λόγος of God. His moral virtues lent authority to his moral admonitions when he interacted with his congregation via sermons. In practice, he had to take into account the various backgrounds, life experiences and spiritual needs of men and women in the audience.[146] A homily was both a personal individual text – for which the preacher was held accountable – and an instantiation of the authoritative discourse of the church, signalled by its reference to scripture, church fathers and documents.

Homilies were one of the main ways to transmit the faith. Cathechetical orations were an important aspect of the last stages of the reception into the church, a long and rather formal process even for those with a Christian background. The teaching instilled in catechumens was perhaps the only established religious education, since there were hardly any Christian schools. The homilies

[143] See J.LR. Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication* (2006), 97 for a contrary view.

[144] For example, the use of Cyrillian texts to support the position of most groups at the Council of Chalcedon in 451 and after it.

[145] See T.G. Weinandy and D.A. Keating (eds), *The Theology of St. Cyril* (2003), 212 discussing Cyril *Ep.* 83.

[146] See C. Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity* (2005), 55 on Gregory the Great *Regula pastoralis*, III (PL77).

to those recently baptised were perhaps the only communications not subject to problems with irregular attendance of liturgies. The extant examples reveal that bishops were eager to link to the right path to salvation the current controversial issues about doctrine, advocating the view they deemed orthodox. In the presentation of the right faith, traditional and newly established doctrines were juxtaposed. To address new problems bishops could mainly make use of preaching and of pastoral letters. The audience for homilies was also not limited to those attending church, since numerous sermons were written down and circulated. It seems that written sermons were particularly popular with monks who would not come into the cities often. There is no reliable information on how they were delivered anew.[147] Since preaching was a regular aspect of some of the liturgical celebrations, usually it was expected even of those, like Atticus of Constantinople, who were not gifted with a great elocution. They could resort to written down homilies at least as models, but also for passages and even the whole text. It seems that in general homiletics was unremarkable in form and content, and did not deal with topical or polemical matters. It is largely unknown what characterised admirable and deficient preaching, and the selection criteria for the writing down and transmission of homilies are usually unclear. Such were the means by which a bishop could endeavour to correct and save his flock when he chose to address a problem.

A bishop was entitled to preach in his see, and he held substantial local authority, especially in more isolated dioceses, but he also could preach by invitation.[148] References to the teaching of other holy men spread their reputation and contributed to the development of local theological schools. A bishop was also responsible for disseminating in his see the communications from his metropolitan, and from synods. Regional synods which ought to occur regularly, but were usually not as frequent as prescribed, did not necessarily curb local incongruous tendencies, and sometimes exacerbated them. In the absence of official centres and references of learning, the dialogue across provincial boundaries and the larger synods tried to restrain the rise of contradicting theological views.

Apart from preaching, the reading of letters, and occasionally of conciliar minutes and acts, of credal statements as well as of non-ecclesiastic letters including *sacras* was used to correct or redirect the faithful. Letters addressed to large groups tended to include fewer details and technicalities than those addressed to a few individuals.[149] The uncertainties noted above about the audience

[147] Circulating homilies often were rather similar to pamphlets. Collections of homilies organised by feast are not yet attested. They became a common resource in later centuries, and many extant manuscripts are in this format.

[148] See W.T. Treadgold, *The Early Byzantine Historians* (2007), 156-7, with the example of Theodore of Mopsuestia in cities near his see.

[149] Compare ACO I 1/1, 77-83 and ACO I 1/1, 83-90. The latter lacks explicit details like written form and ten days. See A. Weckwerth, *Ablauf, Organisation und Selbstverständnis westlicher antiker Synoden* (2007), 32.

of sermons applies also to pastoral letters. Even if the named addressees regarded them highly at first, and provided a formal setting for their reading, akin to preaching, the reaction of the listeners and later uses could vary much. Oral delivery also spread letters, treatises, poems and other works on doctrinal or disciplinary issues.

Written communication

Written works were important for spreading ideas, dialoguing and debating. Although largely illiterate, the late antique Roman world used writings extensively in formal and informal circumstances. The population was used to written texts and to associate authority to them, *e.g.* in the inscriptions on public buildings and the reading of *sacras*. Theodotus explored the significance of a written text in the metalinguistic and theological discussion of *sacra* in Homily II.[150]

Christianity had from the beginning relied on writing for communications and the establishment of doctrine. Over the centuries, stylistic peculiarities developed, apparent in the vocabulary, erudition and arguments related to the Christian faith and scriptures. Bishops, who were expected to remain in their dioceses for most of the time, and had therefore a more reduced mobility than equally ranking aristocrats and members of the imperial administration, resorted often to writing to reach out to all their territories and beyond.

The frequent mention of written texts was not out of place in the previous section on orality. In so far as we work on the transmitted documents, the boundary between oral and written works is blurred. The recorded oral discourses are texts, and texts were generally read aloud. A letter, for example, was considered a dialogue without one interlocutor, or with an imagined absent one, and performed orally, even when it had only one addressee. Orality contributed to the lack of control over the diffusion of texts. It was very impractical to withdraw a text, even when imperial laws trying to contain the spread of ideas specifically ordered the destruction of texts.[151] Reattributing or anonymising works circumvented the sanctions, and contributed for the survival of (fragments of) many texts by banned authors. It seems that at any given moment, only few copies existed of most patristic works, and they were often concentrated regionally. Availability of earlier and contemporary works contributed to independent theological developments and helped to undermine the cohesion of the church.

Concerns with the authenticity and reliability of written works were increasing among church leaders.[152] A written text spoke for the absent author, but

[150] See p. 110.

[151] ACO I 1/3, 69, 21-4.

[152] *E.g.* Cyril's drive to establish Alexandria as a repository of Athanasian authoritative sources, *cf.* T. Graumann, 'Kirchliche Identität und bischöfliche Selbstinszenierung' (2003).

could not defend him. It provided evidence for perusal, but was also subject to tampering and forgery. Preaching had concomitantly the advantage of the presence of the (purported) author, and the disadvantage that it could be registered by stenographers during the performace, who could give it to the preacher for edition, but were not bound to do so.[153] Not all written sermons circulated with the author's approval. However, preachers sometimes revised and distributed their homilies, or developed their (series of) sermons into treatises. Some hymns were also based on suitable sermons.[154]

The relation of homilies and texts read aloud is complex. Texts, especially letters seem to have been read as or in sermons, *e.g.* the Alexandrian Festal letters. Sermons are a substantial part of the extant Christian Greek texts from late antiquity, when some enjoyed significant popularity and were widely distributed. Homilies could be read anew in liturgical context. In many monastic environments, reading of patristic texts or of distinguished contemporaneous speakers was important and often done formally.[155] In the cities, for example at court, homilies could be read outside a church or other religious setting. Even if a written text recorded accurately the author's words, had been transmitted well and was redelivered without introducing changes, the message was subject to the new context, rituality, manner of delivery and audience, and therefore different from the original performance.

[153] A. Merkt, 'Mündlichkeit: Ein Problem der Hermeneutik' (1997), 77.

[154] N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 129; L.M. Peltomaa, *The Image of the Virgin Mary in the Akathistos Hymn* (2001), 137-8.

[155] See also p. 112.

2. Theodotus in Ephesus

Theodotus of Ancyra's only historically recorded actions are his participation in the Council of Ephesus, which also decisively influenced the transmission of his written works. The Council of Ephesus was the one major ecclesiastical event in the lives of most eastern bishops of the early fifth century. Few of the bishops who attended it lived to take part in the Robber Synod of 449 or in Chalcedon (451).

The following narrative selects from the available evidence the most relevant aspects for the context of Theodotus' statements and his sermons. This interpretation[1] shows Theodotus of Ancyra finding his way between the different groups, and taking part in events whose significance neither he nor the other protagonists underestimated. Theodotus seems to have known how to deal carefully with technical and bureaucratic aspects of the Cyrillian Council, and to have employed adequate rational and emotional rhetoric in his pronouncements. There are records of his participation at most stages of the Cyrillian Council, as well as his own works closely related to it. Although Theodotus' personal influence should not be overestimated, his statements are extensive enough to provide many clues with which to carry out this analysis. It is a worthwhile endeavour, if heeding the circular argument between evidence and interpretation.

Recent analyses[2] of the *gesta* have taken into account their characteristics and clarified some difficult passages, including the setting and meaning of many events, especially what happened outside or alongside the conciliar sessions. Relevant questions remain, for example, about the moment when and the setting where texts were brought to the attention of larger groups of bishops, or whether in the presence of the author, perhaps even delivered by him, whether in the presence of a third person being referred to in a text. The material with which one must work on the subject of the Council of Ephesus is (in)famously manifold. The information is scattered across texts in many languages, and some was only rediscovered in the twentieth century. Not even the minutes of the sessions aimed to be impartial.

The minutes of some Cyrillian sessions as incorporated in Greek conciliar collections like the *Vaticana* may reflect the narratives which the Cyrillian

[1] Even without any ambition of providing a full account of the Council of Ephesus, it has been attempted not to 'relier les diverses pièces des actes en un récit dont la trame consiste dans la vraisemblance psychologique ou politico-religieuse que chaque historien (conditionné par ses sympathies et par ses préventions, inconscientes ou délibérées) suppose chez les protagonistes du «scandale œcuménique» (V 2, p. 24, 23-24), ou de la «tragédie» (C 80, p. 25, 25)', in A. de Halleux, 'La première session du concile d'Ephèse' (1993), 50.

[2] Including *ibid.*, E. Schwartz, 'Cyrill und der Mönch Viktor' (1926), C. Humfress, *Orthodoxy and the Courts* (2007), F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), C. Fraisse-Coué, 'Le débat théologique au temps de Théodose II' (1995).

Council soon sent to the court.[3] Skilful omissions contributed much to their ingenuity and success. Loose ends, such as have been pointed out by historians,[4] would have been less apparent to a readership which at best was vaguely acquainted with the events, but lacked reliable sources to confirm details. Nevertheless, the collections, where documents such as letters, laws, edicts and memoirs were added to the proceedings, probably represent more reliable material than *e.g.* the church historians. They do not seem to have had access to now lost material, rather, they relied on a more fragmentary variant of the extant sources.[5] Eye witnesses of the events also provided accounts, but they were hardly neutral observers.[6]

The preparations for the council

Theodotus was not involved in the chain of events which led to the imperial convocation of a council in November 430. It is not clear how well he was informed of the incidents in Egypt, Constantinople and Rome. Travellers such as monks may have brought to Ancyra not only rumours, but also copies of Cyril's, Nestorius' and Celestine's polemical writings, or retold excerpts. The full extent of Cyril's proactive preparations for the synod are hard to gauge, but the theological variety and church political fluidity of Pontica probably encouraged him to find allies there, and to send them some propaganda, formed of letters, Cyrillian writings and Nestorian excerpts.[7] Nearer the council, Theodotus may also have been informed by John of Antioch.[8] Theodotus probably never understood fully the global historical context and provenance of the rumours and documents which reached him. His grasp of the conflict between Nestorius and Cyril before 431 shared little with modern versions. It was informed by local and personal prejudices and interests which influenced his decisions and actions.

[3] A. de Halleux, 'La première session du concile d'Ephèse' (1993), 50, T. Graumann, 'Protokollierung, Aktenerstellung' (2010), 32-4.

[4] *E.g.* the discrepancies in the different lists of names, see A.M. Crabbe, 'The invitation list' (1981), 369.

[5] Their testimony is important for the study of the reception of the council in the following years, and for an assessment of the extension and quality of our sources.

[6] *E.g.* ACO I 1/5, 12-13 and 125-7.

[7] Perhaps similar to ACO I 1/5, 10-12.

[8] Theodoret's *Ep.* CXII to Domnus, who would become bishop of Antioch in 441, replying to the news of an upcoming synod in Ephesus in 449, narrates events related to the Council of Ephesus in 431, and mentions that 'before the journey to Ephesus' John of Antioch wrote to Eutherius of Tyana, Firmus of Cæsarea, and Theodotus of Ancyra allerting them that Cyril's twelve chapters were Apollinarian: Y. Azéma (ed.), *Théodoret de Cyr. Correspondance* (1965), 50-1. On Theodoret's network and epistolography, see A.M. Schor, *Theodoret's People* (2011), especially 113-4 on Domnus. No extant Council of Ephesus related document prior to it mentions Theodotus. *Cf.* p. 66.

The invitation to an imperial synod by the *sacra* of 19 November 430 was directed to a limited number of bishops chosen mainly for the importance of their sees, but also included some renowned theologians. Although the council was meant to solve a dispute between Alexandria and Constantinople, Cyril's supporters far outnumbered Nestorius'. The participants were not chosen on the basis of their mastery of the conflicting Christological views. The aim was unanimous agreement, and the right view should not, in theory, depend on the numerical strength of a party. The invitation list suggests the court was not up to speed on church political and doctrinal developments. The *sacra* of 19 November[9] put the ecclesiastic needs -- i.e. concerning theology – ahead of the combined public demands, which included the accusations against Cyril brought up in Constantinople two years before. The priorities were largely due to Cyril's efforts, but Nestorius and the Orientals[10] could see in the theological grounds an additional chance to challenge Cyril.

Theodotus was invited because he was a metropolitan bishop, not for specific Christological views. His sermons, even if known beyond Ancyra, would probably not have sufficed for him to be counted among the theological eminences which were invited in addition to the metropolitans.[11] The chronology of Theodotus' Homilies I and II suggests he faced a similar Christological debate in Ancyra, possibly a local development, sharpened by likely tensions between the input through intellectual and religious links to Antioch, and the influence of theological ideas from Egypt or Palestine, brought by monks, for example.[12] The occasion of both sermons was one of the proliferating festivities celebrating an event in the life of Christ, and had allowed him to expound the wonder of the divine economy and its simply paradoxical elements. His clear focus probably built on the legacy of the fourth-century Trinitarian debates. During them, almost inevitably, the arguments addressed the understanding of the

[9] ACO I 1/1, 114-6, especially p. 115, 18.

[10] The group of the Ἀνατολικοί was defined less by geographical criteria of affiliation than by antagonism to Cyril's anathemata, and, from concern with matters beyond their dioceses, by great unease with Nestorius' troubles. Their sessions were led by John, the metropolitan of Antioch, whom the court then singled out to stand for the 'Orientals' in the discussions leading to the Formula of 433, and subsequently in its enforcement. He had to deal with the challenges of several bishops more persistent in their defence of Nestorius. See L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 270ff. Antioch, however, exerted no regional influence comparable to the structured control Alexandria had over Egypt.

[11] Proclus of Cyzicus exemplifies how direct involvement in the Nestorian controversy did not imply attending the council. Instead, Dalmatius, the bishop actually occupying the see of Cyzicus, went. Dalmatius signed the letter of protest from 21 June (ACO I 4, 28, 18), but soon changed sides, and was present at the session of 22 June. It is not likely that Proclus was left out deliberately, on account of his views which the emperor and court probably knew well from his preaching in Constantinople.

[12] *Cf.* ACO I 1/1, 10-23 (Spring 429); S. Wessel, 'Nestorius, Mary and controversy' (1999), 12ff.

Incarnation, and then became more technical during the Apollinarian disputes.[13] The writings of influential theologians like Theodore of Mopsuestia and the Cappadocian fathers provided ample material on the Christological topic.

The weighty and deferential rhetoric employed later describing retrospectively the reaction of bishops to this invitation[14] does not necessarily portray how bishops like Theodotus reacted. Any particular self-awareness among the invitees that reflects Theodosius' references to the kind and importance of the gathering[15] to which they were called remains hypothetical. Synods were common on a diocesan level, but the only widely recognised parallel for a council bringing metropolitans from every corner together to vote on the matters of the church and of the οἰκουμένη[16] was Nicaea. Theodotus' and his contemporaries' information about the circumstances of that distant event relied largely on collective memory.[17]

In the build-up to the council, Cyril apparently continued to exert significant influence[18] on the court. One of his successes seems to have been that the *sacra* brought to Ephesus in June 431 precluded civil or criminal charges to be brought up at the synod or at the legal court of Ephesus, but to refer them to the imperial court in Constantinople.[19] In this way any personal accusation was excluded from the council, and none made it to the court of the provincial governor or of the emperor. It had become impossible to bring up charges against Cyril.[20] Furthermore, in the *sacra* of June 431, the question of orthodoxy was clearly in the forefront.

Insofar as the *sacra* from November 430 corresponds to the initial imperial intentions in convening the council, they were hardly met by what the bishops ended up doing. Theodosius II expressed hopes that Ephesus I would increase the homogeneity of ruling in the church throughout the Empire, for example, by issuing canons akin to those of Nicaea. The emperor had voiced the desire for the discussion about religious issues to rely on the importance of the creed, unanimity and dialogue.[21] While none of these was accomplished straightforwardly, the minutes and appended documents strove to persuade the court and further addressees how the imperial wishes had been met. In the wake of Ephesus I, Theodosius may have turned even more to law to provide the unity which religion increasingly seemed unable to give.[22]

[13] N. Russell, *The Doctrine of Deification* (2004), 217.
[14] *E.g.* ACO I 1/3, 28, 22-6.
[15] ACO I 1/1, 115, 26ff.
[16] ACO I 1/1, 115, 32-3.
[17] See p. 25 on Constantinople 381 and the recollection of Nicaea 325.
[18] See p. 29.
[19] ACO I 1/1, 121, 9-12.
[20] E. Schwartz, 'Cyrill und der Mönch Viktor' (1926), 11-2.
[21] ACO I 1/1, 115, 19-20.
[22] Work on the Theodosian Code began in 429, see p. 19. See F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), 1.

If Theodotus was in Ancyra when he received the letter(s) convening the council, the imperial support for travel by road probably helped his journey to Ephesus. Ancyra was well situated on the cross-roads, and a highway led directly to Ephesus.[23] It must have taken him far fewer than the forty days that separated Antioch from Ephesus by road.[24] Theodotus may have been among the first to arrive if he paid heed to the instruction of setting forth speedily after Easter and without detours.[25] No problems in Ancyra which might have delayed him are recorded for the Spring of 431.[26] There is no evidence that Theodotus met other bishops on his way, although others from Anatolia or farther East would have travelled by the same roads passing through Ancyra.[27] Neither is it known if Theodotus had met Cyril before arriving in Ephesus, or that they had corresponded, although he may have been acquainted with some of his letters, homilies and other works.

The reports about what happened in Ephesus before 22 June are extremely varied. Statements about the delays or the circumstances for those waiting were exaggerated within the bounds of rhetorical conventions. There is not much evidence for imperial provisions for the bishops and their groups, except the confidence[28] that Ephesus would be fully capable of receiving some 600 people.[29] In Ephesus, some bishops may not have received the deference they thought was due to them or to which they were used in their own see. Apparently, the most important metropolitans received their own lodgings, where they could entertain larger groups.[30] Nestorius and several Orientals may have been quartered at imperial offices or with officers.[31] These arrangements reflect the cohesion of certain groups, but may also indicate the limitations of Ephesian hospitality. Animosity likely led some bishops to keep or be kept away from

[23] C. Foss, 'Late antique and Byzantine Ankara' (1977), 29.

[24] *Cf.* L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 209, based on John of Antioch's letters to Cyril, ACO I 1/1, 119, 14, and to Theodosius II, ACO I 1/5, 126, 16. The imperial patronage for travelling by road must have weighted against the much more usual travel by sea between Antioch and Ephesus. See A. de Halleux, 'La première session du concile d'Ephèse' (1993), 61-2.

[25] ACO I 1/1, 116, 1-5.

[26] In contrast, John of Antioch claimed to have been delayed by local famine, daily riots, heavy rain: ACO I 1/5, 125, 18-21.

[27] Perhaps even John of Antioch, whose supposed sojourn in Ancyra (ACO I 4, 79, 36) may have happened on his return from the council, probably with other bishops ('*nos*': ACO I 4, 80, 6).

[28] *Cf. sacra* sent through *comes* John, August 431, ACO I 1/3, 31, 19.

[29] The metropolitans were asked to bring only a small retinue (ACO I 1/1, 115, 23). Among the *c.* 200 bishops which came, some may even have brought no assistants, but there would also be large groups. A certain number of members of the imperial administration were also sent by Theodosius to Ephesus for the council.

[30] For example, ACO I 1/2, 9, 21, ACO I 1/5, 119, 4. See also L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 206.

[31] ACO I 1/2, 10, 25.

Memnon's episcopal lodgings. Thus, spread through the city, most bishops were probably unaware of all the ongoing conversations, debates and plans.

The likely arrival of John of Antioch before the legates of Celestine seems to have been decisive for Cyril to put the first conciliar session into action.[32] The legates would probably confirm the Roman support, strengthening the authority on Cyril's side.[33] Cyril had the support of Rome in the form of Celestine's letters, with a set of conditions to be met by Nestorius.[34] These were the main contribution of the see of Rome to the council, beyond any doctrinal input, or significant participation of the legates.[35] Theologically they would contribute but little to equal the support Nestorius would have from some Oriental theologians, such as Theodoret, who were coming with John. Like Alexandria and Antioch, the Roman see was distinguished from most metropolitan sees by many titles, among them 'apostolic see',[36] whereby was acknowledged its distinctive relation to the apostles, especially Peter and Paul.[37] No uncommon authority or solidity of its theological assertions was conferred to it following from this preeminence.[38] From the point of view of the Eastern Roman Empire, Rome could stand for all western bishops.[39] Distance hindered interaction and collaboration in imperial administrative and ecclesiastic matters alike.[40] Eastern metropolitans often informed Rome about their problems,[41] but the 'detailed' accounts exchanged with distant sees sometimes exploited that they might lack other source for the problems under scrutiny.[42] Passages in Celestine's letters reinforced the importance of the authority of the metropolitan

[32] See the discussion about ACO I 1/2, 67, 7-9 in E. Schwartz, 'Cyrill und der Mönch Viktor' (1926), 36 and L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 210ff.

[33] ACO I 1/1, 83-90, especially 90, 20-3.

[34] ACO I 1/1, 83, 1-15, to which Cyril could add the anathemata of ACO I 1/1, 40-2.

[35] L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 420.

[36] *Cf.* ACO I 1/3, 53-63, where also the honorific 'Pope', in Latin and in translation, is used by Philipus, Arcadius, *et al.* See also L. Abramowski, 'Der Bischof von Seleukia-Ktesiphon' (2011), 11-2.

[37] Particularly relevant for the Roman See was the distinction conferred on Peter in *Matt.* 16:18, which Theodotus explores in Homily VI, B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 126ff.

[38] L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 420-1. See further J. Herrin, *Byzantium* (2008), 45ff., F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), 54, 159, L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 149ff.

[39] For example, ACO I 1/3, 66, 10-1.

[40] *E.g.* ACO I 1/2, 52, 21 - 53, 12.

[41] See p. 23.

[42] Against the long-standing view that Rome largely ignored the information which Nestorius sent to Celestine, perhaps because the Greek posed a language barrier, see H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 254-5. Although he endorsed Cyril's theology, he did not adopt it fully. For example, his credal assertions included contents that Cyril was actually condemning as Nestorian, as discussed in L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 171-2. Instead of a deliberate attempt to preserve a view which shares aspects with both Antiochene and Alexandrian theologians, this is seen as an inability of Latin authors to filter non-Cyrillian ideas in view of the lack of resources and distance from the debate.

sees, the example of fathers like Athanasius,[43] and of abiding by synodical decisions, like the Roman synod which issued these letters.[44] They came in handily for the Cyrillian Council, and provided authoritative support to its legal approach to these specific points.

Theodotus was in Ephesus at least a few days before the council started, as can be inferred from his evidence on Nestorius' statements in Ephesus.[45] It is not known where Theodotus lodged. It is likely that after arriving in the city, Theodotus met several bishops who were already there and arriving subsequently, and became involved with what was happening in Ephesus in relation to the council. Probably he also met Cyril but nothing suggests close links or allows us to include Theodotus in any hypothetical group of planners of the session(s), which would be tightly knit around the bishop of Alexandria and is best exemplified by Memnon and Flavian. Their influence on the unfolding of the events during and between the sessions seems more directional and purposeful than Theodotus' actions.

Cyril had a tight grip on the Egyptian bishops,[46] but otherwise alliances and commitment to a side of the debate shifted significantly.[47] Great metropolitan sees had considerable ecclesiastic power over small sees in the vicinity, but not always on theology. Furthermore, several dioceses were not closely controlled by any other see over long periods of time, *e.g.* because of remoteness or being situated between rivals. The dioceses around Galatia displayed both theological diversity and absence of an established ecclesiastic hierarchy. Although the alignment of most bishops was quite predictable, the partisan boundaries were not firm. Bishops and metropolitans who later would stand against each other still met and engaged in conversations. On the evening of Sunday, 21 June 431, the readiness to accept an invitation for holding a

[43] ACO I 1/2, 88, 21.

[44] Athanasius – whether portrayed as hero or victim, his opponents, however, always the object of caricature – provided the model of the representative of orthodoxy *par excellence*, against all sort of heresies; see P. Gemeinhardt (ed.), *Athanasius Handbuch* (2011), 416-8. Most bishops, from Gregory Nazianzen to Theodoret of Cyrrhus, put forth claims of resemblance to him. Patriarchs of Alexandria had an easier task, since they could emphasise the succession in the see, and even claim authoritative versions of his texts. See T. Graumann, 'Kirchliche Identität und bischöfliche Selbstinszenierung' (2003). On Cyril's reliance on Athanasius, see N. Russell, *The Doctrine of Deification* (2004), 22ff., J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 132ff., S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004), 9ff., 111ff. In the fourth and early fifth century, Alexandria may also have had the closest to a structured religious education to be seen in the East.

[45] See p. 59. Theodotus' theological affinity with Cyrillian ideas as expressed in Homilies I and II makes the narrative in J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 60-5 implausible.

[46] Nicaea Canon 6, discussed in P. Norton, *Episcopal Elections* (2007), 120-1.

[47] Noticeable in the variants in the lists of signatories, especially those referring to voting, *cf.* A.M. Crabbe, 'The invitation list' (1981), however, see T. Graumann, 'Protokollierung, Aktenerstellung' (2010), 14 note 28.

conciliar session the next day, ahead of the arrival of all bishops,[48] largely reflected the existing allegiances.

The Oriental sources have other interesting details on what the arriving bishops were doing in Ephesus. At their second session, Candidianus said that up to that weekend (probably 27-28 June) the bishops had not been celebrating the liturgies.[49] Nestorian and Oriental bishops complained to the emperor[50] about these circumstances. The version of such eye-witnesses suggests that these obstacles came into place when preparations for holding a first session started. They imply clearly defined parties. More substantial impediments were mentioned by Orientals who arrived later, like John of Antioch who wrote about prohibitions of liturgies and the blockade of churches and other religious spaces.[51] His account, which is not first-hand, uses a confused time frame and vaguely describes the existence of various obstacles of different natures. The complaint may be a negative representation of what were infra-structural limitations in Ephesus for all bishops to carry out their religious practices, and the conflict of local liturgical practices with what the bishops were used in their dioceses, spread across the empire. The claims by Oriental bishops that Memnon made it impossible for them to celebrate mass, to preach, or to access the Ephesian churches were probably vague on purpose, in order to suggest that this problem had befallen only them, and from the start.[52] However, the complaints suggest some important episcopal activities had been hampered by the circumstances. The impediments deprived the bishops and their assistants from important platforms to disseminate and clarify their ideas. Their preaching was curtailed.[53] Local clerics might have read letters and homilies of visiting bishops, but their choice could be significantly guided by Memnon's preferences.

Constantinopolitan and Oriental bishops seem to have welcomed Theodotus, and he could freely engage in conversations with Nestorius.[54] Thus, it is unclear how close he was to the Cyrillian bishops, or was known to be, during this time of waiting. Perhaps, if the purported obstacles applied only to the Orientals, Theodotus could exercise his episcopal duties and rights, including preaching. During these days, his Homilies I and II may have been read, or (re-)delivered, even by him. They could clarify his stance, and offer the bishops a chance to compare his views to Cyril's.[55] They could also be part of a Cyrillian effort to

[48] See the next section on p. 49.

[49] ACO I 4, 43, 41 - 44, 1.

[50] ACO I 1/5, 14, 19-23. The letter is signed by Nestorius and 11 bishops (16 bishops, with allusion to further signatories in ACO I 4, 31, 11-29).

[51] ACO I 1/5, 124, 34-7.

[52] L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 206.

[53] *Cf.* later, in Chalcedon, Theodoret of Cyrrhus and John of Antioch preaching (ACO I 1/7, 82-3; 84, respectively).

[54] ACO I 1/2, 38, 10-2.

[55] ACO I 1/2, 73, 26-7; 80, 32.

win over bishops who were supporting Nestorius and to strengthen the theological foundation of Cyrillian bishops who knew little of Cyril's Christology or would be more willing to support it if it relied not only on the works of the polemical bishop of Alexandria.

Session of 22 June

On Sunday 21 June, Cyril took the initiative to convene the council by summoning the bishops to a session, mostly relying on word of mouth spread by his Egyptian bishops and other supporters. Probably, he lacked support from imperial officers. The *comes domesticorum* Candidianus, who as bearer of the *sacra* to the council[56] ought to have convened and inaugurated the council at the convenient time,[57] was openly opposed. 68 bishops, including 20 metropolitans protested, planned to refuse to attend or walk out, and signed the *contestatio*.[58] Theodotus joined the majority without contestation, putting into practice what he later preached on unity and harmony in the church, and their costs. If he had concerns with fairness towards Nestorius, he chose to voice them at the session.[59] Theodotus was probably aware he had much greater theologically affinity with the Cyrillians than with the Orientals. An effort to win over recalcitrant bishops, to which Theodotus may have contributed, possibly by circulating his works, led several bishops to join the Cyrillians, including some from dioceses around Ancyra, such as Pius of Pessinus.[60]

The Cyrillian sources claim that the bishops gathered in the church called after Mary.[61] This was an ill-fated venue to stand for Nestorius, whose views were vulnerable to attacks relying on the veneration of the Mother of God. It was brought about that the *comes domesticorum* Candidianus read the letter of the emperors, and that was, for the Cyrillians, the opening of the session. It was followed by the 'expulsion' of the Nestorian bishops and of Candidianus, who insisted on the presence of all invitees.[62]

[56] ACO I 1/1, 120-1.

[57] ACO I 1/5, 13, 35 - 14, 1.

[58] See ACO I 4, 27-8, and the similar declaration by Nestorius and his (unnumberred) bishops, in ACO I 4, 30-1. Candidianus' narrative version (ACO I 4, 31-4) specifies the walk-out on the previous day, when invitations were sent around. See L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 212.

[59] ACO I 1/2, 9, 6-8.

[60] A.M. Crabbe, 'The invitation list' (1981), 382ff.

[61] Documents, including those discussed on p. 93, refer to events taking place in the great church, and it is not certain that the church of Mary is meant. The situation of the building or its ecclesiastic status in summer 431 is still much debated. See S. Ladstätter and A. Pülz, 'Ephesus' (2007), 410-3, R. Harreither, 'Die Synoden von Ephesos' (2002), S. Karwiese, *Die Marienkirche in Ephesos* (1989). Also, A. de Halleux, 'La première session du concile d'Ephèse' (1993), 65-6.

[62] ACO I 1/5, 119, 31-4.

The absence of the imperial officer, Candidianus, and clerks, had deprived the council from support in organising, recording and validating the sessions, which was expected to have many aspects in common with the ceremonial and bureaucracy at the imperial court.[63] The Cyrillian Council at Ephesus strove to compensate for the doubts on the validity of the session by claiming to follow closely imperial[64] and divine commands,[65] by alluding to the authority of Nicaea which apparently had done so, and by providing carefully prepared collections of documents. There seems to have been interest in elaborating such acts speedily, which may have contributed to the choice of including several already extant documents. The fashioning of the sessions, and consequently of the proceedings, as 'paper' based, became a trademark of Ephesus I. Forensic aspects of reliance on written evidence and Christian insistence on agreement to the Nicene fathers were among the Cyrillian motivations. The initiative had lasting consequences, not least for reoccurring in later councils.[66]

The events of 21 and 22 June were unsettling even for bishops used to a lack of rigid formal conventions in their rather frequent synods.[67] An awareness of the weak claims to validity of the session allied to concerns for orthodoxy, probably sincere among many non-leading bishops at least, made all participants eager to strive for an authoritative self-representation, and to see themselves, or especially the 'best' among them as fathers of the church.

Theodotus asks for Nestorius' presence

Theodotus is mentioned early in the minutes of the session of 22 June, interrupting a slightly inconsistent pattern of introducing documents to the assembled bishops. Peter, presbyter of Alexandria and *primicerius* of notaries, had described some of the letters exchanged between Cyril, Nestorius and Celestine, with which the council ought to be concerned. However, instead of these χάρτας, the proceedings describe how the imperial *sacra*[68] was read, at Juvenal's request. Cyril cut short a debate between Firmus of Cæsarea and Memnon

[63] H. Hess, *The Early Development of Canon Law* (2002), 64.

[64] A council summoned by the emperor ought to follow his guidelines, even in his absence, as in some sessions at Nicaea. See ACO I 1/5, 119, 10 and l. 30-1.

[65] ACO I 1/2, 8, 13-4 and 9, 2-3.

[66] See extensive discussions in T. Graumann, 'Protokollierung, Aktenerstellung' (2010), 32, 34, *id.*, 'Towards the reception of the Council of Ephesus' (2010), *id.*, '"Reading" the First Council of Ephesus' (2009), *id.*, *Die Kirche der Väter* (2002), *id.*, 'Kirchliche Identität und bischöfliche Selbstinszenierung' (2003), A. de Halleux, 'Les douze chapitres cyrilliens au concile' (1992).

[67] The regional synods and the imperially backed councils of the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries were very varied and lively, even if by no means informal gatherings, and governed by certain common aspects, which helped to validate them. See R. MacMullen, *Voting about God* (2006), 7, T. Graumann, *Die Kirche der Väter* (2002), 15, 68.

[68] ACO I 1/1, 114ff. See T. Graumann, 'Protokollierung, Aktenerstellung' (2010), 10f.

of Ephesus, about how many days had passed since bishops arrived for the council, and urged the council to have the documents (χαρτία) read. To further legitimise the session, he referred to the *sacra* read by Candidianus, although it was not in their hands, to be included in the acts. Cyril summarised the task as 'the faith be investigated and justice defined without delay'.[69] He juxtaposed the 'theological' discussion with a juridical decision, bound to be a conviction. The elucidation of the theological questions and religious differences was being sidelined.[70]

Theodotus spoke at this moment, lest the council proceed without attempting to have Nestorius present:[71]

> The reading of the documents (χαρτίων) shall be at the appropriate time, however, now it is fitting that also the most beloved of God bishop Nestorius joins the proceedings, so that the things of piety are established from common knowledge and agreement.

At first sight, Theodotus' intervention gives the impression that he was interested in an open discussion of religious teachings in the presence of Nestorius. The following discussion widens the range of meanings. An extreme interpretation would present Theodotus as a very manipulative bishop, well acquainted with an overarching plan by Cyril, only saying this to see fulfilled some of the conditions posited by the emperor, so that the council could claim to have tried to do what it could. The inclusion of this passage in the proceedings would then be similarly motivated. Should Nestorius come, his presence would cause him more harm than good, lending validity to a session where his cause was helpless. Should Nestorius not come, then, following this vein of thought, Theodotus' intervention decisively contributed to the forensic approach of the threefold summons as explored by the council.[72] Theodotus would then probably have known that his request would lead to the deposition as it happened. That was a quick solution with several disadvantages, ranging from reinforcing parallels with the Chrysostomian crises to casting a dark shadow of pretence on the assessment of Cyril's and Nestorius' writings which could be characterised as some sort of dialogue and examination of faith.

Throughout the *gesta* Theodotus is presented as holding a leading position among the Cyrillians, and yet by a second interpretation his request apparently goes against Cyril's document-centred strategy for the council. However much Cyril had planned in advance, nothing hints Theodotus was privy to his ideas. Theodotus was among the few middle ranking bishops from Asia Minor, who initially tried to contribute to leading the action. This was convenient for Cyril, who needed support, especially while there was a shadow of the accusation(s)

[69] ACO I 1/2, 9, 4-5.
[70] T. Graumann, *Die Kirche der Väter* (2002), 361-2.
[71] ACO I 1/2, 9, 6-8.
[72] A. de Halleux, 'La première session du concile d'Ephèse' (1993), 71.

which had initially motivated Nestorius to ask for a synod. Slowly, but without objections, the participation in leadership reduced to a small collegiate presiding over the sessions, and eventually Theodotus was also no longer part of it.[73]

Should the members of the council have been presented with a farce, where many played different characters, and (almost) all were kept in the dark about Cyril's intentions, then any analysis of the minutes would require an interpretation based on suspicion, and imply that all events were part of a well-planned staging, manipulating not only the other members, but also the addressees of the acts, that is, the emperor and his court. Cyril certainly worked hard to guarantee a favourable outcome. It is, however, open to serious doubt if this went so far as to suggest that all protocolled statements by Cyril's followers are to be seen as a façade for hidden aims. This trend largely agrees with Nestorius' analysis of the events at Ephesus in his *Liber Heraclidis*,[74] where he benefited from hindsight. He interpreted the invitations as a disguise for bringing him before the council and condemning him, even with the use of violence. In Nestorius' opinion, the effort to have him present was only attempting to have his presence as evidence that he acknowledged the self-established council as legitimate, and thereby endorse a condemnation decided in advance, even if a mock interrogation happened. Also in this reading, Theodotus' statement would masquerade his hostility to Nestorius, and be part of a grandees' plan.

However well defined Cyril's plan of action was, it relied on registering the feedback of the council to selected documents. Theodotus' intervention postponed this, and it caused a significant delay indeed. Considering the turbulent beginning of the session, this adjournment may have been welcomed, for example to give time to organise documents properly, adequate for the new circumstances.[75]

The reference to an unanimous decision[76] in Theodotus' statement echoes the emphasis on consensus and unanimity which was contained in the imperial *sacra*,[77] and to which Cyril had also just alluded.[78] Before that, Candidianus

[73] See R.J.A. Talbert, *The Senate of Imperial Rome* (1984), 225 for parallels of collective leadership in the Roman Senate. A normalising representation of councils alongside the importance of participants like Juvenal and Acacius of Melitene in later events, *e.g.* Chalcedon 451, has influenced the identification of the main metropolitans who would be steering the sessions in Ephesus and the identification of the presiding bishops. See T. Graumann, 'Protokollierung, Aktenerstellung' (2010), 22-3, 32, R. Price, 'Presidency and Procedure' (2009), 243-5, 266-7, T. Graumann, *Die Kirche der Väter* (2002), 358, 362-3, J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 71, E. Honigmann, 'Juvenal of Jerusalem' (1950), 212, 232, P. L'Huillier, *The Church of the Ancient Councils* (1996), 147.

[74] F. Nau (ed.), *Le Livre d'Héraclide de Damas* (1910), 81-125. Especially *Heracl.*, 195, *ibid.*, 117.

[75] See p. 50.

[76] T. Graumann, *Die Kirche der Väter* (2002), 362-3.

[77] ACO I 1/1, 120, 25.

[78] ACO I 1/2, 9, 1.

too had vividly referred to it,[79] when trying to prevent the session. It must have been fresh in the memory of the participants, and was thus a good argument for Theodotus' request, on which he built deliberately.

Theodotus' intervention allowed the presentation and registration of the account that on the previous day some bishops had tried to invite Nestorius, and of what had happened. The invitation then counted as one of the summons. Theodotus' request of Nestorius' presence refers primarily to the problems of the 22 June session, from which the accused was absent. It allowed the narrative about Nestorius' reaction to the invitation to be included, but it is unlikely that Theodotus aimed at it, knowing precisely what had happened. Like other bishops, Nestorius had been informed of the decision to start the council probably by a group of bishops going to one or some of the several residences where bishops were lodging, and informing them of it. They carried no official formal invitation, nominally sent by someone. Anonymous 'other bishops' who went along may refer simply to a group they had met on the way, but perhaps the expression avoided the names of some who did not join the Cyrillian Council straightaway,[80] possibly motivated by Nestorius' reaction or other events that day. The reports about the first invitation resemble, for example, those of the meetings with Nestorius on previous days, when groups of bishops had access to Nestorius and to others who were with him, and had conversations.[81] At the first 'summons', Nestorius was likewise approachable.

The composition of the groups who went to summon Nestorius on 22 June suggest that previous acquaintance, regional or ideological affinity played no role.[82] The tone of the summons became increasingly juridical, clarifying the legal situation and consequences, developing from an invitation to the council to a summons to face accusations as a defendant. The first call, although similar to the earlier informal meetings, was voiced in more deliberative and didactic terms than those, and the last employed the most technical language. The bishops' report emphasised how they went dutifully for the sake of faith and religion, and faced rough soldiers,[83] the willingness to undergo suffering echoing the topic of keenness for martyrdom. In a heightened tone, the reports emphasise the danger of death, and draw on scriptural similarities, exploring parallels with the Passion of Christ, for example, the conflict with soldiers and the waiting outside, and even with the parable of the wicked husbandmen.[84]

[79] ACO I 4, 31-2, 33, 18, 34, 1-4.
[80] ACO I 4, 27ff., A. de Halleux, 'La première session du concile d'Ephèse' (1993), 68, A.M. Crabbe, 'The invitation list' (1981).
[81] ACO I 1/2, 38, 2.
[82] ACO I 1/2, 10-2.
[83] ACO I 1/2, 11, 28.
[84] *Luke* 20:9-19, *Mark* 12:1-12, *Matt.* 21:33-46.

From these parallels, the involved individuals and council could draw strength and vindication. The theme of fighting for the faith was expanded by Theodotus in Homily VI to encourage the bishops.[85]

Nestorius later acknowledged[86] that he had requested soldiers for protection. He, not Memnon, had control of clerks and soldiers in the environs of his house. However, Nestorius' claims are only plausible if his fears refer to the forces controlled by Memnon, and the assumption that they were similar to Cyril's *parabalani*, some of which apparently were also in Ephesus. After all, he could not reasonably fear a group of bishops, even if young and strong, to the point of not receiving them.[87]

At the session, Juvenal and others described Nestorius' absence as a deliberate, not well motivated (ἀγαθῶι συνειδότι) avoidance of making a stance.[88] These suspicions were taken into account for his condemnation. The Cyrillians were confident they had obtained a successful valid pattern, set in motion by Theodotus' request. The same suspicions were mentioned when John of Antioch was summoned on 16 July and did not come either.

There was no canon or synodical precedent for how to proceed in Nestorius' absence. However, Juvenal claimed that three summons were sufficient by an ecclesiastical instruction,[89] and then asked for the creed (ἡ ἐκτεθεῖσα πίστις) of Nicaea to be read, so that arguments (λόγος) about faith might be contrasted to it.[90] The Nicene πίστις was always central to Eastern Christianity,[91] and by asking for the creed to be read, Juvenal made it possible that Cyril's and Nestorius' letters be compared to it. Cyril's letter was read first, once Peter 'reminded' the bishops of it, and if in the earlier instance Theodotus' had brought up a delaying objection, here Acacius of Melitene obliged with a request.[92]

Theodotus' assent to Cyril's letter

After Cyril's first letter to Nestorius was read, he requested the council to vote on its orthodoxy. The reliance on agreement of written documentation to an accepted standard, in this case, the Nicene creed, was a technical juridical tactic

[85] See p. 147.

[86] *Heracl.*, 199 F. Nau (ed.), *Le Livre d'Héraclide de Damas* (1910), 119-20.

[87] Nestorius had in John Chrysostom a good precedent for not attending a synod. Also Cyril was aware of the similarities. See J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 338 on Cyril's letter to Acacius of Beroea (ACO I 1/7, 148, 28-30).

[88] ACO I 1/2, 12, 22-3.

[89] A. de Halleux, 'La première session du concile d'Ephèse' (1993), 71 on Apostolical Canon 74 – M. Metzger (ed.), *Les constitutions apostoliques* (1987), 302 – and its disputable status since based on Canon 2 of Constantinople (381).

[90] Notice Nestorius' use of it as proof-text early in the controversy: ACO I 1/1, 29-30.

[91] See p. 101 and J.A. McGuckin, 'Mystery or conundrum?' (2008).

[92] ACO I 1/2, 13, 12-5.

which he set forth clearly.[93] Unanimous approval followed, and the minutes record what 125 bishops said when they acquiesced. Their order reflects rank as well as geographical connections, with rare deviations.[94] Theodotus was the fourth to speak, after Juvenal, Firmus and Memnon.

The statements are in general quite elaborate.[95] Juvenal set the approving tone. The individual votes fall in a spectrum between those which try to lend precision to the relation between the letter and the Nicene creed,[96] and those which refer to the personal meaning of both texts for the voter. Despite all the rhetorical fireworks, the statements would remain rather impersonal if the expression of the authority of religious men in patristic terms would not turn them into personal credal appropriation of both. For example, Firmus clearly linked his assent to Cyril with '[...] having received exactly this teaching (δόξα) from the holy bishops, my fathers'.[97] The reference is to the transmission of tradition, but narrowed down to the fathers that are relevant to him. The juxtaposition of the father title to bishop was traditional,[98] but in Firmus' statement it refers especially to the episcopal succession – whereby a bishop grounds his person and position in a specific line of bishops and teachers, which become personal ancestors –, and simultaneously puts the acknowledged consensus of Cyril's teaching with the Nicene creed in his biography of faith and place. 'Father' is thus not a general term for the venerable eminent figures of the previous generations of theologians. The bishops refer to it as a potency which influences the personal stance on matters of faith, and actually generates it. They describe with it their connection to the faith and church of the past. Cyril's teaching is deemed to overlap with the personal adoption and reception of the teaching of the church. Neither Firmus nor any other bishop give more particulars of such personal instantiation of tradition. Thus are left open the references to ways of appropriating the ecclesiastical doctrine whether liturgically, *e.g.* through baptism, or didactically, *e.g.* by the study of certain authors and works.

Firmus was followed by Memnon,[99] who was succinct. The title of father he added to Cyril's name was a recurrent salutation for the Alexandrian bishop, suggesting different emphases and accents of the concept of 'father' are blurred and mixed in the votes. It carried no weight of age when referring to bishops as members of an ecclesiastical gathering, as an equivalent to the dignified address of senators as *patres conscripti*. When Cyrus of Aphrodisias' turn

[93] ACO I 1/2, 13, 20-5.
[94] A.M. Crabbe, 'The invitation list' (1981), 379.
[95] See T. Graumann, *Die Kirche der Väter* (2002), 373-8 for a detailed analysis of the pattern in all votes.
[96] H.-J. Sieben, 'Zur Entwicklung der Konzilsidee' (1973), 29-33.
[97] ACO I 1/2, 14, 6-7.
[98] *Cf.* E. Nacke, *Das Zeugnis der Väter* (1964), 24-34, with respect to Cyril.
[99] ACO I 1/2, 14, 8-12.

came, he addressed the preceding bishops as 'fathers'.[100] The expression is used to describe the members of the synod especially by the participants summoned later.[101]

Theodotus articulated his support for Cyril[102] with clear references to some aspects of the important role of 'father' pursued by many who spoke after him. He used the widely accepted reference to the Nicene creed by means of the number of fathers gathered in Nicaea. Thus, he focused on the actions of the authors of this set text, which had just been solemnly recited. Theodotus presented a correspondent representation for the turn each bishop had on 22 June in sanctioning persons and texts.[103] The allusion encompassed both the effort of the contemporaneous theologians to formulate adequately the faith, and the voting of the participants. Their collective task and success as a synod, modelled on that council, could then be apprehended as a similar event at least by the structural analogies. Theodotus contributed to the adoption by the participants who spoke next of this approach to the synodical procedures in which each consciously emulated one of the anonymised Nicene fathers. He mentioned not only the Nicene πίστις and Cyril's letter in one breath,[104] but he also juxtaposed the action of the fathers with the action of 'our father',[105] namely Cyril, and so he drew the analogy of their present role as fathers to that of the Nicene fathers. The flattering exaggeration contained in this approach starts a comparative apprehension of Cyril's role and dignity, and approximates the bishops to their ancestors. An immediate tendency to use assertions employing the father-title for Cyril is evident; Flavian, speaking next, employs it twice.[106]

The ranges of signification linked to the contexts of both the Nicene and the Cyrillian synods overlap once Theodotus had addressed Cyril as 'our father' and had made explicit the parallel to the fathers gathered at Nicaea. Further associations are found in various guises in several statements of the plenum. Even when the explicit title of father is absent, they deal with parallels Theodotus introduced. The address of the individual as 'father' brings with it the authority of antiquity and holiness, by the reference to the Council of Nicaea. Even statements which were formulated plainly contributed to draw Cyril and the Nicene Council closer. Some bishops, like Valerian, went much further in spelling the connection out.[107]

Theodotus was followed by Flavian, Acacius of Melitene, Iconius, and all others in recognising the correctness of the faith expressed in Cyril's second

[100] ACO I 1/2, 15, 28.
[101] T. Graumann, *Die Kirche der Väter* (2002), 277.
[102] ACO I 1/2, 14, 13-21.
[103] ACO I 1/2, 14, 18-9.
[104] ACO I 1/2, 14, 14 and 18.
[105] ACO I 1/2, 14, 19.
[106] ACO I 1/2, 14, 24 and 28.
[107] ACO I 1/2, 16, 15-21.

letter to Nestorius. The statements expressed the orthodoxy of the letter which is much more than the approval of the agreement of Cyril's letter and the Nicene symbol of faith which they had been asked. Theodotus is probably representative of the majority of the bishops whose theology did not agree completely with the letter under perusal, and nevertheless approved it. After the unanimous endorsement, the conformity of the implications of any passage was impossible to question. Even the orthodoxy of any other work by Cyril was hard to question since most votes had been cast on the author, not the letter.

Theodotus' brief condemnation of Nestorius' letter

Once all assembled bishops had affirmed that both the fathers who had expounded [the faith] and the letter of Cyril to Nestorius 'believed' similarly, Palladius of Amaseia requested the reading of Nestorius' letter, so as to see if it too was in concord with the exposition of the Nicene fathers.[108] It was the reply to Cyril's letter which the council had just endorsed, in which Nestorius rebuffed a few passages. After Nestorius' letter was read, a chorus of condemning statements ensued, and Theodotus joined it in ninth place.[109]

This contrasts with his eager initiative to see Nestorius summoned, and his early support and acquiescence to the Cyrillian doctrine, voiced in fourth place. Instead, at this moment, three bishops stated their opinion outside the hierarchical order. Analysing what they spoke, it would seem that the change of order may reflect less their haste in expressing condemnation, than a need to fill in a certain gap. Theodotus may not have been quick to give his statement, when in the quite lively and agitated meeting the votes were following in swift succession.[110]

Juvenal spoke first again,[111] delivering something of a diatribe which broadened the accusation to all those who would choose to support Nestorius, or share his views. He used crucial (*e.g.* ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως) and absolute (*e.g.* οὐδαμῶς σύμφωνος, ἀλλότρια πάντηι) terms, setting the tone. He pointedly pronounced an anathema over Nestorius (employing ἀναθεματίζω).[112] Thenceforward, almost any verdict less damning than his would amount to an expression of divergence of opinion in the council.

Flavian and Firmus spoke after Juvenal, echoing his thoughts in an equally inflammatory way. Valerian of Iconium, Iconius of Gortys and Hellanicus of

[108] ACO I 1/2, 31, 6-9.
[109] ACO I 1/2, 33, 3-7.
[110] See A.M. Crabbe, 'The invitation list' (1981), 385.
[111] ACO I 1/2, 31, 18-20.
[112] It lacks the formulaic structure of an anathema which ought to give a doctrinal decision the appearance of juridical precision. See A. Weckwerth, *Ablauf, Organisation und Selbstverständnis westlicher antiker Synoden* (2007), 25, *id.*, *Ablauf, Organisation und Selbstverständnis westlicher antiker Synoden* (2010), 20f.

Rhodes followed with similar thoughts. Instead of suggesting that Theodotus missed his 'spot' because of their haste, they may have filled an awkward gap caused by Theodotus' 'reticence'. It was impossible not to condemn Nestorius, and Theodotus may have wondered how to best express himself.

Acacius of Melitene then took the initiative of going ahead of Theodotus and managed to be heard, in seventh place.[113] He provided a statement that was even longer than Flavian's approval of Cyril's letter, and is surpassed in length, in the minutes of 22 June, only by his evidence against Nestorius. Acacius' condemnation of Nestorius' letter had an argumentative structure which borders on conciliar homiletics.[114] He listed several of the apparent theological absurdities (denial of the real oneness of God with human flesh, so that any aspect of the salvific economy would be from the flesh alone, and also Nestorius' claim of Cyril's theopaschism), as well as the legal technicality (absence after three summons) brought against Nestorius. He related the charges on psychological grounds, referring to Nestorius' conscience (συνειδότα ἑαυτῷι). That is, taking his religious shortcomings for granted, Acacius interpreted Nestorius' refusal to attend as springing from fear that comes from the bad conscience, which is so great as to cause him to make use of such worldly protection as soldiers. The theological topics, especially those on birth and death of Christ, may have had a persuasive and/or reassuring role, perhaps directed particularly at Theodotus. Neither the reference to Nestorius' absence, nor the listing of theological topics lead to a theological discussion or were directions picked up in other votes. Acacius apparently brought order back into the proceedings. He was followed by Memnon,[115] who resorted to a short assertion but expanded the offensive vocabulary (*e.g.* συκοφαντίας, βλασφημίας).

Theodotus' similar verdict was not brief, but more to the point than previous ones. He interrupted the trend of increasing aggressions, for example by adding no offence when acknowledging the incompatibility with Nicaea, and by again awarding Nestorius a formal title (εὐλαβεστάτου) still due to him.[116] His formulaic profession of relying on the Nicene creed encompassed the Cyrillians (τῇι μὲν ἐκθέσει *πειθόμεθα*). He openly acknowledged that he was siding with them against Nestorius and whoever thought 'these things'. It was the first matter-of-fact restrained statement in a trend of bishops trying to stay low-profile.[117]

[113] ACO I 1/2, 32, 14-30.

[114] See L.M. Frenkel, 'What are sermons doing in the Proceedings?' (2013).

[115] ACO I 1/2, 32, 31 - 33, 2.

[116] Also in Acacius' reference to the letter: ACO I 1/2, 32, 14-5.

[117] Bearing in mind the careful editorial composition of the *gesta*, the tenor and lack of theological content of the votes to Nestorius' letter may nevertheless provide evidence that the bishops were not familiar with his theology, not even with the excerpts which are included in the minutes later. See T. Graumann, *Die Kirche der Väter* (2002), 388. As for the excerpts and the lack of response thereto, they may have been read but no one cared and/or only the few in the front

On the one hand, Theodotus was the last of the leading group to speak. On the other hand, most bishops after him followed his example of saying only as much as needed. Palladius did not follow this example,[118] but from Donatus onwards, few[119] deviated from this 'calmer' tone. In all their variety, the statements agree with Juvenal's tone-setting verdict.

Theodotus' evidence against Nestorius

According to the minutes, Theodotus was not involved in the next events during the session of 22 June. Celestine's and Cyril's letters were read,[120] and Flavian enquired if Nestorius had fulfilled the conditions mentioned in them. The bishops Theopemptus and Daniel answer Flavian's question, when they testify on the delivery of Celestine's and Cyril's letters. Theodotus' seeming low profile throughout this is typical of what most other bishops did during the whole council.

Fidus, bishop of Joppa, intervened and pointed out Acacius and Theodotus as witnesses of Nestorius' ongoing failure to give up his wrong views.[121] It is Fidus only contribution to the course of action. He employs uncommonly strong language, not only summoning them but adjuring them (ὁρκίζω). One infers that an Evangelion was lying exposed (πρόκειμαι) at the venue, and by that the witnesses ought to swear to say the truth. Fidus uses the making of minutes (ὑπόμνημα)[122] as a further threat.[123] The intimidating tone suggests a lack of trust in the veracity of statements in conciliar setting, and that a certain unwillingness to testify against Nestorius could be expected.

Fidus knew with certainty that Theodotus had met and heard Nestorius. It is not clear if this was widely known, or if Theodotus and Acacius had informed others what they knew, and that they were willing to testify. Fidus may have seen them where Nestorius had spoken publicly, perhaps preached. If Theodotus was still a friend of Nestorius until the 'eve' of the council despite their established theological disparities, Fidus' convocation was an aggressive summons,

seats could hear them, which also applies to the reading of the letter. The echoes in conciliar homilies, such as in Theodotus', could suggest that attention was paid to the excerpts, but these intertextualities can also be related to other texts, especially Cyril's letters.

[118] ACO I 1/2, 33, 8-14.

[119] The hostility of Euoptius' statement, who later was part of the Cyrillian delegation to the court, stands out. ACO I 1/2, 34, 9-14.

[120] Respectively, Coll. Vat. 10 and 6.

[121] ACO I 1/2, 37, 23-7.

[122] The 'guarantee of the records' could be referring to existing written accounts of Acacius' and Theodotus' meetings with Nestorius, possibly including what was spoken. They may have been at hand during the council, but since the testimonies were included in minutes, there would be no reason to preserve them in the collections, or in another form.

[123] The making of *acta* is also used as a warning by Ambrose in Aquileia, 381. See A. Weckwerth, *Ablauf, Organisation und Selbstverständnis westlicher antiker Synoden* (2007), 19.

juridically effective, yet echoing the summoning of two false witnesses at Christ's trial,[124] an unwelcome secondary meaning, which Theodotus' statement, with further scriptural allusions, perhaps counters.[125]

Cyril rephrased the request,[126] remembering the 'oaths imposed' but 'vouchsafing' for the integrity of Acacius and Theodotus by selecting out of the repertory of usual episcopal attributes that of 'most God-beloved in all respects'. Fidus seems to have had in mind a specific event, 'three days ago', but Cyril leaves it unspecified. Fidus' 'what they heard' becomes 'discussion with him [Nestorius] over the orthodox faith', which Theodotus and Acacius 'initiated'. Acacius' account describes discussions. Clear boundaries between Cyrillians and Orientals had not yet been established when Theodotus and Acacius met Nestorius, but the extent of theological dialogue is questionable. When the conversations happened, they were deliberative and didactic, but at the session, the reference to them became charged with legal significance. They provided testimonial evidence that Nestorius, by keeping his views 'unchanged', had not fulfilled what had been requested by Celestine, neither in 10 days, nor to the time of the session.

Theodotus spoke first, ahead of Acacius, and said:

I am pained on behalf of a friend, but beyond all friendship I honour piety. Because of it, I am forced, beyond all faintheartedness concerning what I am being asked about, to tell the truth. I think there is no need for our testimony, since his views have become clear from the letter to your religiousness. For what he proclaimed to say there about God, that is to say, the only-begotten, reproaching him for the humanity, he also here spoke, discussing (διαλεγόμενος) that concerning God nourishment with milk or birth from a virgin should not be said. Thus also here he often spoke that God should not be said to be two or three months old, and these things not only we, but also many others heard himself discussing (διαλεγομένου) with us not many days ago in Ephesus.[127]

Theodotus' statement is precise in the facts generally known (friendship, evidence in Cyril's letter). The sought after evidence springs from these, and remains vague.[128] The context of Nestorius' statements is not specified, neither is it explained how the slogans can be said to 'insult the humanity'.[129] Foremost

[124] *Matt.* 26:60-1.

[125] See p. 63.

[126] Suggesting that not all had heard it, or that it had not been phrased adequately.

[127] ACO I 1/2, 38, 4-12.

[128] Acacius' statement provided more sharply worded theological slogans. Theodotus' vaguer statement may reflect his pastoral concern with unity striving to prevent dissension and confusion on doctrinal problems among his audience, especially the allied bishops. Without clear details on essential theological matters, incompatibilities could be avoided or accommodated, preserving the appearance of cohesion and unanimity needed for the validity and authority of the council. See L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 277 on related post-conciliar problems.

[129] Themes related to Theodotus' and Acacius' statements are found in the reading of Nestorian excerpts, *e.g.* the second (ACO I 1/2, 45, 22ff.) on the birth of Christ, and the eleventh

at the beginning, Theodotus keeps the tone of his disapproval of Nestorius' letter, refraining from excessive involvement, so that not by his words Nestorius would be condemned, for there is other evidence.

Theodotus may have attempted to leave room for a more balanced account of Nestorius' views. For example, he highlighted 'regarding God' in μὴ δεῖν *περὶ θεοῦ* λέγειν γαλακτοτροφίαν μηδὲ γέννησιν τὴν ἐκ παρθένου, echoing Nestorius' reservations about Mary – inadmissible to his opponents. By the end of his statement, Theodotus leaves no doubt about his commitment to the success of the Cyrillian Council. He places Nestorius' denial of speaking of God as an x-month old baby climactically last. It was a slogan which later documents duly explored,[130] and became quite widespread. In homiletics, Theodotus also relied on catchwords.

Especially at the end, when precise circumstantial details are lacking from Theodotus' statement, he uses the first person plural, perhaps to compensate the vagueness, for it suggests that others could relate similarly. Thereby, Theodotus also distances himself from Nestorius, being only part of a large audience to which Nestorius had access. This was probably the partisan entourage, including bishops, staying with him, and perhaps some from the population of Ephesus.

Was Nestorius preaching in Ephesus?

Theodotus' statement possibly contains an important clue for preaching in a conciliar setting, since he used διαλέγω, which can refer to preaching.[131] The statement may therefore imply that Nestorius had preached in Ephesus over the previous days, contradicting Nestorius' narrative and Oriental complaints.[132] Apart from broad meanings, related to conversation or the practice of dialectics, in classical Greek, especially in a philosophical context, διαλέγω could already refer to persuasive discourses along guidelines, whose audiences, however, cannot be inferred. Later uses span 'discourse' and 'lecture', which in patristic Greek can encompass preaching.[133] Some passages from Eusebius suggest that

(ACO I 1/2, 48, 15-90) on the subject of suffering. Indeed, the anti-Nestorian slogans in several texts like Cyril's letters bear enough resemblance to Nestorius' assertions to seem deduced from but untrue to the context and therefore to Nestorius' views. See the lengthy reassessments, and discussions about the validity of Nestorius' claims of misinterpretation in *Heracl.* by L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974) and A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben* (1979). The accuracy of their testimonies cannot be judged. L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 207-8, for example, attributes the origin of Theodotus' and Acacius' differing versions simply to general confusion, not blaming any bishop with deliberate misquoting.

[130] See p. 70.

[131] Adopted by A.J. Festugière, *Ephèse et Chalcédoine: actes* (1982), 229. *Cf.* S. Wessel, 'Nestorius, Mary and controversy' (1999), 2.

[132] See p. 48.

[133] G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (1961), 355.

occasionally it was used with the meaning of preaching,[134] but other quotations, especially from Basil,[135] highlight how vaguely that was meant.[136]

If διαλεγόμενος, διαλεγομένου mean 'preaching' in Theodotus' statement, he would have attended liturgical celebrations where he heard Nestorius preaching and heard similar reports without necessarily drawing near to Nestorius. In view of the obstacles set up by Memnon, the passage suggests that the bishops around Nestorius were holding liturgical celebrations with homilies attended only by themselves.

However, in my interpretation, both instances of διαλέγομαι more likely refer to conversations, talks, and arguments. The statement suggests the frequency of such meetings, so that Theodotus would not have avoided Nestorius in the time prior to the council.[137] Further evidence that Nestorius was not preaching is found in the conciliar letter to Celestine.[138]

Cyril and Nestorius seem to have made no attempt to meet while in Ephesus before the council.[139] Both were probably aware of the 'efforts' of bishops to engage them in conversations so that one of the speakers might change sides.[140] Acacius' statement exemplifies how the parties were unyielding. Each wanted to win the other over to its views, pointing out their misunderstandings, even blaming differences of vocabulary, but none would openly relinquish anything.

In practice, different ideas coexisted but only while there was no theological debate about them. 'Discussions over the faith' were conducted in terms of orthodoxy and heresy, and therefore no toleration of deviating or attenuating views could exist. Arguments were led in terms of a rejection of heresy, and absolute categories were brought in, describing for example who could be saved, always supported by scriptural passages. Where accommodation of differences in belief and practice can be noticed in late antiquity,[141] it is related to matters which were not brought into focus in a region until a later date. If affiliation to a father was revocable,[142] the condemnation of certain theological views, and

[134] Eusebius, *H. e.* VII, 30, 10; *ibid.*, VI, 19, 16.

[135] Bas. *Hom.* 14, 1 *In ebriosos*, PG31, 444, 47 - 445, 4, sounding rather like 'About such hopes, lets *talk* tomorrow.'

[136] C.F. Crusé, *The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius Pamphilus* (1851), for example, does not translate any of the referred instances in Eusebius as 'preaching'.

[137] The conversations may have resembled the active correspondence (oral or written) to more 'distinguished or leading' bishops, which, allied to an emulation of their teaching was the main religious preparation for priests and bishops, in view of the lack of formal education. See L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), H.I. Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation* (1948), 429-34.

[138] ACO I 1/3, 7, 8-11: '...how also in Ephesus itself he dialogued with some of the blessed metropolitan bishops, men not without distinction, but regarded and most-pious, and dared to say that "I do not confess a two- or three-month old God", and other worse things he also said to these men.'

[139] P. L'Huillier, *The Church of the Ancient Councils* (1996), 147.

[140] See Acacius' purpose on ACO I 1/2, 38, 18-9.

[141] See p. 32.

[142] *E.g.* Jerome, *Adversus Rufinum.*

the wording used to achieve it had more lasting consequences. Once the 'confrontation with Nestorius had been led with the ardour of a battle about ultimate truths, about salvation and doom, the sympathisers themselves were the ones who complained of any stepping back from the former stance as a "compromise with a foul trade-off".'[143]

Theodotus' reference to Nestorius speaking in front of many may have been intended to convey his openness and frankness, as a positive note. A biblical echo can also be traced between Nestorius speaking what Theodotus cited in front of many, and Jesus' claim that he had spoken openly to the world.[144] Theodotus portrays Nestorius as having been teaching a sympathetic audience, among which were some who at the very moment of the council were turning against him, and using there what they heard from him. This is similar to Jesus' teaching in synagogues or at the temple, and deferring to others the description of his teachings.[145] In John's Gospel, only false witnesses stand forward to describe Jesus' teaching. The balance would tip positively for the Cyrillian party, if the witnesses were deemed true, and their statement contained truthful assertions with which to condemn Nestorius.[146] The reference to Nestorius' oratory can also be seen as a concluding deliberate condemnation of Nestorius, exemplifying his hubris by insisting on his error even in front of many.

Faith contingent friendship

When summoned to give evidence against Nestorius, Theodotus prefaced it with a brief reference to his friendship with Nestorius. In so far as its relation to the main matter at stake is not straightforward, or immediately recognisable, it resembles Flavian's excursus earlier in the session.[147]

By 'friend', Theodotus may have just referred to a fellow bishop, however, it is unlikely that he would have employed a term that suggests a strong bound at that moment of the session, after the orthodoxy of Nestorius' letter had already been rejected, unless there was some truth to it. The traditional interpretation

[143] T. Graumann, 'Kirchliche Identität und bischöfliche Selbstinszenierung' (2003), 200.

[144] *John* 18:20.

[145] *Ibid.*

[146] Also Cyril complained about false witnesses. To Theodotus' evidence of the perseverance, Acacius added the accusation of only temporary or apparent but unreal retraction, echoed in Cyril's concern in Coll. Vat. 67, ACO I 1/2, 66, 12-6.

[147] Flavian of Philippi, recognised as an eminent elder statesman, regardless of lacking the status of metropolitan, mentions that he is representing Rufus, metropolitan of Thessalonica, when he expresses his assent to Cyril's letter, not because it is the first occasion he had a chance to speak but because it is relevant, making his vote count twice. In this technically legal matter, the vote of an extremely staunch supporter of Cyril carries with it the importance of a metropolitan's, who would have stood for the Orientals. See A.M. Crabbe, 'The invitation list' (1981), 372.

of this passage is literal and has informed many biographical accounts about Theodotus.[148] The next paragraphs place it in the late antique context.

Theodotus, once a friend of Nestorius, was clearly opposed to him by the time of the session of 22 June. Even before Nestorius' condemnation, Theodotus gave up all personal friendship with him. Human bonds of affection,[149] could not remain in view of their differences on religious matters. Before arriving in Ephesus, Theodotus may have known that views he was criticising in his sermons were defended by Nestorius. The statement suggests that Theodotus looked for dialogue in Ephesus or wanted to see for himself how it stood with Nestorius, despite the adverse or hopeless situation of healing the rift. This readiness contrasts with Nestorius' refusal to attend the Cyrillian Council. The move made sense juridically, but it was a conduct that was easy to portray as not quite compatible with Christian values related to frankness, truthfulness and openness. It was furthermore compounded with Nestorius' actions and human behaviour in Ephesus.

Those whose life was meant to be committed to religion, like bishops or monks, aimed for a certain 'high' friendship, trying to emulate the heavenly communion as well as possible on earth. They strove to replace worldly friendship in so far as it conflicted with the Christian one grounded on faith.[150] True Christian friendship involved a togetherness in the divine love, linked by theories of sacraments by which the union between the believers in past, present and future is greater than any human bond, such as love or friendship. Therefore, deviation of orthodoxy, which was considered a proof of absence of grace, of the presence of the Holy Spirit, of openness to the divine love, wisdom, was a hindrance to friendship. Furthermore, friends ought to be open to one another, teach and learn from each other, share ideas, *etc.* and therefore to have an *inimicus veritatis* as friend endangered one's own faith and salvation.[151]

[148] For example, O. Bardenhewer, *Das fünte Jahrhundert* (1923), 197.

[149] This does not seem to be as complete a rejection of 'social' friendship (deemed incompatible with Christian values) as, for example, Augustine's (*cf. Conf.* IV).

[150] S. Rebenich, 'Freund und Feind bei Augustin' (2008), 20, 25-8.

[151] The infectious character of nearness to those who do not have correct faith occurs in Theodotus' Homily III, ACO I 1/2, 71, 23ff. Within a medical simile, wrong assumptions about the Christian faith are *imparted* via *communication by word of mouth*, *exchanged* by discussion, and, in Theodotus' opinion, grow when matters of faith are given as *subject for discussion*. Within the conciliar setting, the danger of the spread of the malady points to the need to separate and segregate the 'diseased member'. Acacius showed the infectiousness of ideas, purportedly accepted by Nestorius, which required exclusion from communion and deposition, by adding in his statement what some around Nestorius were saying, even if evidence on Nestorius' belief had been asked for. See M. Dörnemann, *Krankheit und Heilung* (2003) for an extensive discussion of the medical simile, from the Pauline letters to the fifth century, referring back to both Old Testament and classical antiquity viz. Hellenism. Also J.LR. Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication* (2006), 89.

Claims of friendship and enmity relied on the fluidity of the concepts and the use of the same vocabulary covering a continuous range of friendship from the political (scorned even in classical theorisation) and the philosophical (including any terms related to *paideia*) to the Christian one. All meanings were topical, and provided ample material for theologians. In practice, the types of friendship were not mutually exclusive.[152] Instances of ideal Christian friendship were exceptions largely exaggerated in encomia. It was mostly a rhetorical device[153] and as such, it explored freely the wide range of associations of a vocabulary which was also close to other theological topics, like communion.

The strict standards for Christian friendship were expected of bishops but reality disagreed with the ideal discourse. Leading bishops were involved in the social networks of the local aristocracies, from which they often came, and many had attended schools for rhetoric and philosophy frequented by men of all faiths.[154] They cultivated friendships within the classical conventions, and explored them to gain success for which they were also recognised.[155] Nevertheless, when gaining (at least local) political and juridical authority,[156] and especially when solidifying their spiritual authority, the bishops used the vocabulary and rhetoric of ideal Christian friendship. They applied it both to their self-representation and to attacks, particularly when confronting a bishop.

Theodotus' reference to his friendship with Nestorius is more elaborate than formulaic ways of speaking about a fellow bishop whose orthodoxy was being questioned. The following tentative sketches on the nature and source of their friendship are further hampered by the limited information about Nestorius' background and friends. Theodotus may have come from Ancyra and studied in Antioch.[157] Nestorius also seems to have acquired in Antioch the erudition which his style and arguments show.[158] The good rhetorical qualities of Theodotus' homilies, and the seamless weaving of ideas and phrases so that their source cannot be otherwise identified tally with an eclectic education as the Antiochene was.[159] This approach helped to incorporate new ideas and phrases, as may have been the case with Theodotus, when he sided with Cyrillian views.

[152] Christian friendship could not tolerate religious differences, and was thus unlike other types of friendship. Acknowledging the difference, theologians and holy men expressed their desire for it. They wished it for themselves and for humanity, if not in this present life, then at the time of (eschatological) salvation. See S. Rebenich, 'Freund und Feind bei Augustin' (2008), 13.

[153] *E.g.* ACO I 1/4, 4, 22-8. Even employed in the letter exchange of Cyril and John of Antioch, *e.g.* ACO I 1/7, 155.

[154] E.J. Watts, *City and School* (2006), 154, 158-9. The repudiation of the values of classical rhetoric and philosophy as 'Hellenic' did not prevent their use, or the continuation of the praxis.

[155] C. Rapp, 'The elite status of bishops' (2000), 397-8.

[156] R.E. Payne, 'Persecuting heresy in early Islamic Iraq' (2009), 248.

[157] See p. 33.

[158] L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 24ff.

[159] The Antiochene school(s) apparently relied much on manuals and *florilegia*, encompassing (or at least open to) all philosophical schools, but without a 'specific school characterisation'. This

Theodotus' friendship with Nestorius may have arisen in a monastic environment. If little is certain about Nestorius' early monastic life,[160] nothing can be inferred about Theodotus' links to monasticism. The only possible reference comes from a later anti-Nestorian source.[161] An Antiochene monastic connection may suggest Theodotus had some discipular relation to Theodoret like Nestorius.[162] Both explanations for the friendship of Theodotus and Nestorius, whether from a teaching or a monastic environment, are highly hypothetical.

Any conjectured bond of earlier literal friendship which could be appropriately mentioned at a council would only still have been entertained in 431 if Theodotus and Nestorius had not been aware of their theological differences. The antagonism of their views originated prior to the council, as exemplified by the obvious contrast between the view advocated in Nestorius *Epistulae ad Cyrillum* 1, 2, and Theodotus' Homilies I and II. When the latter were read in Ephesus, as well as in other contexts where they are intertwined with the issues pertaining to the Council of Ephesus, the audience would have related the homilies to the Nestorian controversy and identified the object of Theodotus' criticism with Nestorius. As stand alone texts, however, they are far more ambiguous, or at least veiled in their engagement with the specific doctrinal controversy. In that sense, they do not prove Theodotus' knowledge of facts or texts relating to what is usually described as a chain of events leading to the council, or of the content of Nestorius' preaching in Constantinople. Theodotus' homilies prior to the Council only prove that problems related to a proper understanding of Christology were relevant to the initial audience. If first delivered in Ancyra, they add evidence of widespread brewing tensions, closely related to the developing veneration of Mary,[163] and the celebration of feasts like the Nativity.[164]

makes it difficult to spot in texts elements which reflect an Antiochene teaching environment. See L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 25. *Cf.* R. Cribiore, *The School of Libanius* (2007), 37-41, 225-7.

[160] 'Return to my prior monastic life' in ACO I 1/4, 53, 21 (*cf.* ACO I 4, 64, 8, ACO I 1/3, 67, 5). Probably at the monastery of Euprepios, because of links to Theodoret, *e.g.* the later Syriac legend, N. Brière, 'La légende syriaque de Nestorius' (1910), 3, 15-7, 4, 24-5, 18. See also F. Loofs, *Nestorius and his Place* (1914), 27, F. Nau (ed.), *Le Livre d'Héraclide de Damas* (1910), 362.

[161] In *Vita Petri Iberi* 19-20, Rufus names only three of those who followed Peter's ascetic example in Constantinople. His set of 'brothers Theodotus, Proclus and Sophronius' cannot be identified, but 'it is possible that at least two of the names mentioned evoked associations with well-known, contemporary figures who had demonstrated their anti-Nestorian zeal' in C.B. Horn, *Asceticism and Christological Controversy* (2006), 133, *cf.* C.B. Horn and R. Phenix (eds), *John Rufus: the Lives* (2008), 38-9. Although this could provide a valuable link between Theodotus and Proclus, and explain the assimilation of the beginning of Theodotus' Homily I in Proclus' IV, the chronology speaks against the veracity of this information. Else, it would be relevant that Rufus characterises them as 'illustrious in power' and 'builders and stewards of the royal estate'. In any case, it does not shed light on Nestorius' and Theodotus' 'friendship'.

[162] L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 24ff. only rules out Nestorius' and Theodoret's co-discipleship.

[163] E.g. Cyril *Hom. pasc.* 8, 572B (year 420).

[164] *E.g.* ACO I 1/2, 74, 2-5.

Nevertheless, it may be sensibly assumed that rumours, even accounts of the apparently quite public and substantial disturbances in Constantinople would have reached Ancyra.[165] Theodotus ought to have reacted to this, quite likely trying to obtain details of Nestorius' views, especially if there had been an earlier acquaintance. He may have been exposed to a rather caricatured presentation of Nestorius' views if Cyril's antagonistic writings reached him. Lack of evidence disallows ascertaining whether the latter approached Theodotus, even if Cyril probably also looked in Asia Minor for allies when trying to expand his support base especially in the months prior to the Council of Ephesus, reaching out beyond the usual sphere of Alexandrian influence.

The dynamics of early fifth-century church politics may have further contributed to sour any earlier friendliness between Nestorius and Theodotus. At the time, the still fluid spheres of influence of provinces and dioceses[166] were changing significantly, not least to accommodate the inevitable expansion of Constantinople, and moving towards a more explicit and rigid structure. The provinces of Asia Minor had to establish their autonomy and also try to maintain it in face of the (implicit or deliberate) aspirations of Constantinople. This possible straining eventually involved Ancyra, since at the Council of Chalcedon, the then Bishop Eusebius described a *status quo* where Constantinople was involved in the appointment of bishops in Galatia Prima.[167] However, any conflict between the sees of Constantinople and Ancyra during the episcopacies of Nestorius and Theodotus on matters of ecclesiastic structure or discipline remains speculative, and a theological motivation for Theodotus' eventual alliance with Cyril seems more likely. Likewise, the scarce and controversial claims about Nestorius' hostile theological campaigning hardly guarantee he intervened uninvited beyond his province.[168] Therefore, without opposing evidence, local, possibly home-grown, theological difficulties seem preferable as the prime motivations for Theodotus' Homilies I and II, wherein he expresses sharpened doctrinal insights which were later inevitably perceived to be incompatible with Nestorian thinking, as expressed, for example, in the *florilegium* of 22 June.[169]

Arguments about friendship are mentioned in other passages of the conciliar acts. For example, the Cyrillian Council describes John of Antioch's deposition as stemming from his attachment to Nestorius 'either because of contentiousness' (against Cyril and the Cyrillians) 'or because of friendship with the man'.[170] Stating in an either-or frame the reasons as human emotions (jealousy,

[165] See p. 18ff.
[166] See p. 22.
[167] See p. 2.
[168] See Footnote 38 on p. 22.
[169] ACO I 1/2, 45ff.
[170] ACO I 1/3, 29, 5-6.

friendship) leaves no room for a decision motivated by affinity of theological ideas, by concern for church hierarchy or by attention to the imperial orders, as understood, for example, by Candidianus. The actions of the Council of the Orientals were linked to the person of Nestorius.[171] The Orientals' dissent from the ideas espoused by leaders of the Cyrillian Council is omitted, and therefore neither the Cyrillian tenets nor the Orientals' criticism had to be detailed. From the Cyrillian point of view on stories of friendship with Nestorius, Theodotus chose the correct option, while John persisted in an error, albeit one which was excusable by human feebleness. This was a door left open for reconciliation, which helped even when the escalation of the conflict made necessary more substantial retractions, which acknowledged some of the concrete reasons for the disagreement.[172]

The 'two or three months old babe' slogan

The phrasing of an anti-Nestorian topos centred on a characterisation of the infancy of Christ which occurs in Theodotus' statement is closely echoed in many later documents. 'ἔφη διμηνιαῖον ἢ τριμηνιαῖον μὴ δεῖν λέγεσθαι θεόν' is a succinct phrase with which ideas that were causing upset earlier may have been encapsulated and turned into a slogan. Even if the meaning of the words διμηνιαῖον, τριμηνιαῖον was clear, their Christological use may have seemed unusual and memorable. Extant written sources suggest that διμηνιαῖον, τριμηνιαῖον were seldom used, generally linked to medical literature.[173] In a theological context they are first attested in Theodotus' statement; however, they may have circulated by word-of-mouth in a Nestorian catchphrase before 22 June, and as such the notaries may have resorted to them when registering Theodotus' statement, homogenising with further documents. The words are also found in several letters, including many by Cyril,[174] when alluding to a highlight of Nestorius' errors. It is generally assumed that Nestorius had used these words to maximise the effect of a statement, which did not fail to impress Theodotus, who repeated them. Alternatively, Theodotus, who often employed neologisms or unusual words, may have coined the phrase to express another variant of a recurring Nestorian theme.

Theodotus' testimony addresses the theme of the propriety of attributing strictly human aspects incompatible with divinity to the God incarnate. It was present in Cyril's and Nestorius' earlier polemics, but none seems to have used

[171] Their arguments, however, were no more 'theological' and less 'legal' than those of the Cyrillians.

[172] ACO I 4, 91, ACO I 1/4, 7-9.

[173] As far as TLG searches (in 2009) helped to retrieve occurrences.

[174] Coll. Vat. 67 (ACO I 1/2, 66, 28), *Coll. Vat.* 81 (ACO I 1/3, 4, 32), *Coll. Vat.* 82 (ACO I 1/3, 7, 10), *Coll. Vat.* 84 (ACO I 1/3, 13, 20), *Coll. Vat.* 140 (ACO I 1/5, 3, 24).

Theodotus' vocabulary. Both had expressed the concern with the incarnate's passibility using images which resonated in popular devotions and drew on details of daily life. In homiletics and other literary genres, narratives, dialogues and mini-dramas explored and expanded gaps of the scriptural narrative, finding space to develop themes relevant to their debate, as exemplified in the paraphrases in Theodotus' homilies.[175] The additional text was not differentiated from scriptural material and the contiguity to authentic verses, as well as the similarity of wording to the verses, allowed the added material to inherit some of the authority attributed to scripture. The material joined to the biblical text and in its exegesis gave more room to ground theological assumptions, and to try to persuade the audience.[176]

Theodotus' and Acacius' witnessing statements[177] are among the few paragraphs in the minutes which address specifically theological topics. During the session, the bishops also heard the reading of written documents with much information about Christology. A reader of the minutes, however, would be faced with little on the theological questions unless 'turning over' to the enclosed documents, since those texts read out aloud were, in the collections, placed outside the narration. One audience of the minutes were the papal legates, at the session of 10 July.[178] They may have known from Cyril's letters that the Eastern Christological debate often discussed the birth and infancy of Christ in a Christological setting. Cassian of Marseilles also had a closely related diatribe, linked to the relation of Jesus to human-experienced time, but focusing more on the conception.[179] Theodotus' emphasis was on childhood. His slogan, strikingly applying human timeframe to Christ, was probably effective on Western ears, overcoming eventual linguistic barriers which could make communication difficult.

Both Theodotus and Acacius claimed in their evidence that because Nestorius disparaged Christ's infancy, many left him. Since they gave no details, a valid implication was that the catchphrase also caused some bishops, initially supportive of Nestorius, to join the Cyrillian Council, and to distance themselves from those who refused to do so. Theodotus' statement brought up one of the most inflamatory descriptions of Nestorianism already circulating. It struck the ears of his first audience, which was the Cyrillian bishops and clerks

[175] For example, Homily VI.4, B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 126, 5 - 128, 14.

[176] J. Kecskeméti, 'Doctrine et drame' (1993), 30.

[177] Theodotus: ACO I 1/2, 14, 13-21; Acacius: ACO I 1/2, 38, 13-30.

[178] See p. 78.

[179] *De incarnatione* VII, 26, where the testimony of Jerome is called upon, is perhaps the most relevant passage in it, showing Cassian's emphasis was on the conception. See also E. Schwartz, 'Cassian und Nestorius' (1914) and M.-A. Vannier, 'Le *De incarnatione Domini* de Jean Cassien' (2003), 61-3. On the attribution to Cassian the Scythian, of Marseilles, distinct from Cassian the Sabaite, of Scythopolis, see P. Tzamalikos, *The Real Cassian Revisited* (2012), 94-6. He suggests that a Latin translation of Nestorius' letter was among the documents which Cassian received from Rome to write *De inc.*

on 22 June, and of future audiences, like the papal legates and the readers at the court. The recurrence of the catchphrase in later works suggests this phrasing was quite influential. It is found literally in Socrates Scholasticus,[180] and Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopulus.[181] Both writers seem to have had access to some sort of conciliar *acta* collection. It is difficult to trace back to Theodotus the influence of the catch phrase.

Theodotus and the verdict against Nestorius

Theodotus' and Acacius' testimonies on Nestorius' recently delivered 'speeches' are mentioned in the introduction to the sentence of deposition of Nestorius:

> and from the things newly stated (ῥηθέντων) by him in this metropolis, and confirmed by evidence.[182]

ῥηθέντων could be understood as 'preach' and probably echoes the similar ambiguous meaning of Theodotus' διαλεγόμενος, διαλεγομένου. Acacius nowhere mentioned public speeches delivered in Ephesus. For legal purposes it was irrelevant whether Nestorius was preaching publicly or not. Evidence was needed that, contrary to what Celestine had demanded, he still kept the same views, far beyond the 10 days after receiving the letter. Furthermore, all nuances of these 'speech' words represent Nestorius sowing dangerous views, and therefore he had to be silenced. Considering Nestorius' reputation at court as a good preacher, the vagueness of the vocabulary probably strengthened the persuasive character of the minutes there.

Acacius' and Theodotus' testimonies were acceptable and sufficient proofs. Even Candidianus, however insufficiently informed about the Cyrillian proceedings, acknowledged this. Otherwise, he might have later said that Nestorius had been condemned without proofs, when answering John of Antioch's 'or did they condemn the man without proofs?'. Candidianus limited himself to say: 'they issued their verdict without any hearing, examination or investigation'.[183] Their testimonies are also quoted in the letter to Celestine, without any detail of the theological discussions mentioned.[184] Cyril even used precisely Theodotus' vocabulary of διμηνιαῖον, τριμηνιαῖον.[185]

If the failure to obey the summons was enough to proceed to judge Nestorius in absence,[186] the failure to pay heed to Celestine's conditions was enough to

[180] *H. e.* VII, 34, 14.
[181] *H. e.* XIV, 34, 70.
[182] ACO I 1/2, 54, 21-2.
[183] ACO I 1/5, 120, 28-31.
[184] ACO I 1/3, 7, 8-11.
[185] See above, p. 68, on *e.g.* ACO I 1/2, 66, 28.
[186] Later the Cyrillians argued likewise against John of Antioch, and the Orientals similarly deposed Cyril, and Memnon in absence (ACO I 1/5, 122).

depose Nestorius. Nestorius' letter, read after Cyril's, had already given elements to describe the heresy being condemned, and the council proceeded to depose a bishop who had, and continued to, espouse views that were 'anathema'.[187]

Theodotus signed the deposition seventh (out of 197), after Acacius.

Strengthening of partisanships

From the perspective of the Cyrillian bishops, the session of 22 June had settled all matters for which they had gathered in Ephesus, and there was no need to hold another session. Nevertheless, they saw themselves as a council also outside sessions according to several conciliar documents, such as letters[188] and homilies: Acacius of Melitene prefaces his sermons with a praise of the gathered council,[189] and the rubrics describe the preaching and reading of homilies to the 'council'.[190] This may refer to formal meetings where all bishops were gathered but which were not conciliar sessions and where detailed minutes were not made.[191] As council they engaged in initiatives involving all or most bishops, like the collective signing of letters, documents, as well as eminently individual ones, like preaching. Both aimed at strengthening (the appearance of) cohesion and promoting the theology of Cyril *Epistula* 2. Since the conciliar *gesta* have no narratives for events outside sessions, information has to be drawn from letters and other documents in the collections, and even more cautiously from later sources to delineate a narrative that is relevant for the study of conciliar homilies.

It seems it was already night when the decision to depose Nestorius had been approved and the session was perhaps followed by a torchlit procession through Ephesus, to much supportive public acclamation.[192] This makes it unlikely that a

[187] The session of 22 June issued a deposition as if it had dealt with disciplinary actions, but the minutes reveal doctrinal questions predominating, and some bishops anathematising Nestorius. See A. Weckwerth, *Ablauf, Organisation und Selbstverständnis westlicher antiker Synoden* (2007), 23-5.

[188] For example, the Cyrillian reply to the imperial *sacra* of 29 June (ACO I 1/3, 10, 28).

[189] ACO I 2, 90, 9-22.

[190] ACO I 1/2, 73, 26; 80, 32.

[191] P. L'Huillier, *The Church of the Ancient Councils* (1996), 55, T. Graumann, 'Protokollierung, Aktenerstellung' (2010), 21-2, with examples of decisions from sessions without minutes.

[192] Cyril *Ep.* 24, ACO I 1/1, 118, 6ff. Even for factual details this letter demands care since it addressed the Alexandrian people, who probably had no independent source to dispute the veracity of Cyril's version. Often more has been read into it than it was ever meant to imply, leading to a very influential appraisal of the Council of Ephesus which also affected previous studies of Theodotus' homilies. 'Si noterà che questa lettera, pur così citata quale testimonianza della solenne proclamazione del *Theotokos*, non fa alcuna allusione alla Vergine deipara ed è solo una specie di bollettino della vittoria ad uso del popolo alessandrino': L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 220.

letter was sent to Constantinople on the same day announcing the deposition.[193] The letter to the clergy and the people of Constantinople[194] exemplifies the Cyrillian effort to propagate its version of the Council of Ephesus. However, between 22 June and the arrival of the papal legates on 10 July, the disputable status of the Cyrillian Council worsened, notably because of the rival Oriental sessions and the antagonistic reaction of members of the imperial administration.

Announcing the news to the world

Letters were the chosen means to spread what the session had achieved, in line with common practice in late antiquity, not least at synods and the communication with the emperor.[195] Theodotus recurrently signed the conciliar letters in a leading position, analogous to his votes during the session. Apparently, the main priority once the council had 'succeeded' was to spread as quickly as possible a narrative of the events convenient for each intended audience. The circumstances probably dictated urgency, since unfavourable accounts had already been sent, for example, Candidianus' report to the emperor.[196]

The Cyrillians were probably aware that the imperial court could be among the obstacles to the acceptance of their decisions. Although conciliar decisions in theory did not require ratification by the emperor,[197] they could be overturned by imperial edict or law, as it happened during the Council of Ephesus.[198] The Cyrillians strove to prevent this, and rather to gain imperial support. They presented the session trying to circumvent most of the problems and conflicts that had happened. Letters spreading as widely as possible the decision of the council in Constantinople, and gaining an important popular support, should hinder the emperor from not ratifying it, lest he be faced with significant protests and unrest. Referring to their zeal for orthodoxy, the bishops were eager to see the outcome of the council enforced, and not be sidelined, as Constantinople 381 had been.[199]

[193] ACO I 1/2, 64, 17.

[194] *Coll. Vat.* 85.

[195] T. Graumann, 'Protokollierung, Aktenerstellung' (2010), 20-1, F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), 33, A. Weckwerth, *Ablauf, Organisation und Selbstverständnis westlicher antiker Synoden* (2007), 22-3. Synodical letters are primarily technical epistles, and like imperial rescripts can benefit from the surge of interest in ancient epistolography, *cf.* D.R. Langslow, 'The Epistula' (2007), 233-4.

[196] ACO I 1/3, 9, 27.

[197] Synodical decisions were universally valid in matters within their scope in view of the assumed unity of the church, and of episcopal authority, until overturned by higher instances, especially statements which had the weight of 'laws', that is, imperial written statements. '[N]othing, of course, was law without the imperial assent': N. Russell, *The Doctrine of Deification* (2004), 50.

[198] ACO I 1/3, 9-10.

[199] See p. 25.

The letter to the clergy and population of Constantinople[200] and Theodotus' Homily III have significant similarities, when keeping in mind the different purposes and genres of letter and sermon.[201] They share images like the medical metaphor,[202] and the letter, which touches already on Nestorius' homilies in Constantinople as the most evident proof of his heresy for the population, mentions Theodotus' and Acacius' statements in the same breath as it alludes to the flight into Egypt, which is a major topic in Theodotus' homily.[203] Nestorius' denial that one should call God him who fled to Egypt occurs in several conciliar documents including Nestorius' reply to Cyril's second letter, read during the session.[204] The minutes of the session on 22 June, do not allude to a renewed denial while in Ephesus, but they contain the topic, which is found among the excerpts from the 'books of blasphemies' also read during the meeting. In the third quote,[205] Nestorius illustrates with *Matt.* 2:13 that 'nowhere does the divine scripture say that God was born of the virgin Christ-mother' since the angels say:

'Rise, take up the child and his mother.' Note that they did not say: 'Rise, take up God and his mother'.

The phrasing of the letter ('recognise as God who fled') corresponds to this excerpt, and is a weightier accusation against Nestorius than what Theodotus says in Homily VI[206] ('who would not recognise the incarnation [correctly], despises the flight of Christ'). Theodotus does not seem to refer to the excerpt, and he may have alluded to an 'attenuated version' which Nestorius pronounced in Ephesus, corroborating the claim of perseverance of *Coll. Vat.* 85.

Theodotus' involvement and contributions on 22 June remain anonymous in all letters, although the events where the minutes had named him as protagonist are mostly described with significant detail, proportional to their influence on the proceedings and as justification of the verdict. In order to identify Theodotus and Acacius by name, access to other sources was needed, but the minutes, for example, were not necessarily as widely available as the letters which were meant to be read aloud to the large groups addressed (*e.g. Coll. Vat.* 85). The letter to Celestine[207] hints most clearly at the identity of the witnesses ('metropolitan bishops') who heard Nestorius' outrages, but it does more than to refer anonymously to Theodotus and Acacius. Without detailing the number

[200] Coll. Vat. 85 (ACO I 1/3, 13f.).

[201] See A. Weckwerth, *Ablauf, Organisation und Selbstverständnis westlicher antiker Synoden* (2007), 34 on synodical letters being penned by leading theologians.

[202] ACO I 1/1, 75, 8-13. See p. 129.

[203] ACO I 1/3, 13, 21-2.

[204] ACO I 1/1, 30.

[205] ACO I 1/2, 46, 5-10.

[206] B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 124, 1-2.

[207] ACO I 1/3, 5-9. Probably sent to Rome soon, perhaps without annexed translated minutes.

of metropolitan bishops, the letter suggests a number of the witnesses held this rank, a detail which is not confirmed in Theodotus' and Acacius' vaguer statements. The importance of the evidence was inflated by this increase in the numbers of people of status and high rank who can testify.

Various sources claim the Cyrillian letters had a successful effect in Constantinople, with chanting processions through the streets, public backing of deeds by monks, bishops, *etc.*[208] even if *Coll. Vat.* 85 had asked the recipients merely to pray for a good and suitable new bishop, but not to actively engage in securing that this choice happens swiftly. It is even possible that the proceedings of the session were, after being handed over to the emperor, read out in a church, to the general public, which accompanied it with acclamations.[209] Furthermore, until the acts were read, the shouts of the people who had gathered for the Sunday worship were interrupted by addresses of 'clerics'[210] and of the imperial *referendarius*. If the minutes were read, Theodotus' deeds would be known in the capital.

The letters mention few names. Delegations, smaller groups, remain unidentified. Names do not clutter the texts. The average reader and listener of the letter could not identify them, only those with access to the minutes. For these, the letters offered guidance and explanation on interpreting the passages of the minutes, while the letters were kept 'unpolluted' and suitable for all audiences. There was no need to identify partisan individuals, since greater authority was seen in the collective power of the council than that linked to any individual, even when individual effort was required. In a reversal of *damnatio memoriae*, often solely the accused and criticised are named. Cyril[211] identifies no bishop from the council, but singles John of Antioch out for his delay, and names Nestorius, Candidianus and Dalmatius of Cyzicus.

Celebrating in preaching

In the unclear circumstances after the session of 22 June,[212] soon there seems to have been occasion for some bishops to express themselves in speeches and sermons. Collections of conciliar documents include several discourses under the heading of homilies. Their rubrics sometimes mention date, venue, setting,

[208] The most comprehensive list is in ACO I 1/2, 65f.

[209] E. Schwartz, 'Cyrill und der Mönch Viktor' (1926), 46-7. His reading of these passages, with words of fairly general meaning, is seconded by the hagiography of the monk Victor, found in (Sahidic) Coptic manuscripts, of which a translation is available in W. Kraatz, *Koptische Akten* (1904), 50-5, especially 54. See E. Schwartz, 'Cyrill und der Mönch Viktor' (1926), 22 for other sources and translations.

[210] The metropolitan was not there, but other bishops were in the capital, according to ACO I 1/2, 68ff. Nevertheless, the addresses by clerics have been explained by 'ein Bischof war ja zur Zeit in Konstantinopel nicht vorhanden', E. Schwartz, 'Cyrill und der Mönch Viktor' (1926), 46-7.

[211] ACO I 1/2, 66-69.

[212] L.M. Frenkel, 'Preaching at the Council of Ephesus' (2012).

insufficient to provide a reliable chronology. This also cannot be inferred from the arrangement of the collections.[213]

In contrast with the letters, the sermons were directed at the audience at hand. The authors could know their sympathies and react to their responses. In Ephesus, the audience was limited by who would go to a Cyrillian event, the size of the building, and who could actually hear what was said. There were probably only favourable and partisan listeners. Apart from bishops, their following and staff, a varied cross-section of the urban population of Ephesus could be present. The proximity to the conciliar events and the possibility of direct contact required significant veracity or very skilful paraphrasing of the events. In contrast, letters were generally addressed to distant and much larger audiences, *e.g.* 'the people', the 'clergy'. Sermons apparently were conceived with less concern that written down versions might be heard not only by the original addressees, than letters were composed. Nevertheless, the arguments and narratives found in sermons, letters and statements were quite similar.

Many conciliar sermons seem prompt celebratory reactions to the session of 22 June, dwelling on Nestorius' deposition and his errors.[214] However, this imprecision may be a deliberate echo of the Cyrillian insistence on the validity and sufficiency of their session, fostered by the collections. An indication of artificiality is the likely chronology. If bishops and others preached only on Sundays and feast days, there was probably no occasion for prompt unhindered celebration since 22 June was Monday. By the evening of 27 June, whereafter the Cyrillian homilies could have been delivered, the Oriental bishops had already arrived (26 June), held their sessions,[215] and communicated to the Cyrillian bishops and to the Ephesian population the deposition of Cyril and Memnon, and the provisional excommunication of their allies.[216] Those who had known about the deeds of who went against the canons and the imperial laws would be received back into communion if they acknowledged their error, repented, accepted the faith of the Nicene fathers without any addition or deletion, anathematised the *capitula* and abided by the imperial wish of peaceful and exact theological dialogue.[217] The Orientals adopted the formats and images used by the Cyrillians to reclaim the authoritative tradition and counter them with their own arguments. The deposition of Cyril and Memnon was grounded in terms of heretical genealogies, and voiced with the medical topos, themes which occur also in Theodotus' Homily III.[218] Other parallels are in the presentation

[213] The position of some homilies among letters and between minutes – *e.g. Coll. Vat.* 70-80 – reflects at best the timeframe of inclusion in the collections, and how they were regarded.

[214] *E.g.* 'πλάνη', ACO I 1/2, 71, 24, 'δυσσεβείας', ACO I 1/2, 71, 5.

[215] ACO I 1/5, 119, 4-21, see N. Russell, *The Doctrine of Deification* (2004), 50.

[216] ACO I 1/5, 124-5.

[217] ACO I 1/5, 122, 30 - 123, 3.

[218] '[...] none of those set apart for priestly ministry to God should be excluded from the church body. But since the excision of the incurable members is necessary for the health of the

of the council in written output which encompassed minutes and letters. Despite ongoing problems with access to churches,[219] the Orientals probably also preached conciliar sermons. Candidianus said he could not prevent the Cyrillian bishops from celebrating liturgies (synaxis, eucharist), what they had not done earlier in Ephesus.[220]

The probable liturgical setting which can be conjectured for the sermons enhanced the effect on the audience of abundant virulent assertions in some homilies,[221] stirring reaction against the Oriental Council. The existence of the other synod is hinted at,[222] but never acknowledged. The Cyrillians did not allude to the depositions and excommunications decreed by the Orientals, lest they would thus recognise them.

Rheginus claims to preach in response to someone who does not allow him to remain silent.[223] Addressed as σοφέ, the requester probably corresponds to a collective clamour, which may have come as well from the bishops of the council as from the members of a large urban audience, addressed literally or ironically as σοφοί. The reference to popular clamour may suggest bishops were among those desiring to hear praises on what they had done.

The brevity of the sermons suggest they were part of sequential preaching,[224] which would allow several bishops to preach during a liturgy. Ephesus in the summer of 431 was like Constantinople, where at any one time several bishops were in the city and could be attending one liturgy. However, Nestorius' and Proclus' homilies[225] have explicit cross-references which are not seen in the conciliar homilies, except in inter-plays of mood, aggressiveness and harshness. The claim that the audience wanted to hear some preaching was probably not directed specifically at Rheginus. The suggestion that he preached extempore does not rule out that the speakers were chosen and arranged beforehand. Similarly, other short homilies, which lack such remarks, may have been delivered to answer noisy requests, or in the belief that preaching was wished for.

The arrangement of Rheginus' sermon and Theodotus' Homily III in the *Collectio Vaticana* echoes the order of the condemning statements of Nestorius' letter. In both cases reactions phrased in violent colours precede more moderate

whole body, it is right that [...]' (ACO I 1/5, 121, 38-40). The medical metaphor also predominates in Celestine's and Cyril's letters prior to the council (*e.g.* the letters to the people of Constantinople by Celestine, ACO I 1/1, 89, 13-5, and by Cyril, ACO I 1/1, 113, 25-9).

[219] ACO I 1/3, 47, 4-6, I 1/7, 74, 39-43.

[220] ACO I 4, 43, 41 - 44, 1.

[221] More predominant in *Coll. Vat.* 70 (ACO I 1/2, 70f.), and *Qērellos* 6 and 8 – B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 62ff., 82ff.; see also pp. 145ff.

[222] ACO I 1/2, 71, 5. See p. 95.

[223] ACO I 1/2, 70, 22.

[224] See the references on p. 12.

[225] The relation of Proclus' Homily I (ACO I 1/1, 103-7) and Nestorius' reply (ACO I 5/1, 37-9) is discussed in N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 65ff.

statements.[226] Theodotus and Rheginus cast in contrasting tones the shared subject of justifying Nestorius' deposition. Rheginus' sermon is virulent and incensed,[227] echoing the tenor of many votes against Nestorius, such as Juvenal's. The onus was on Theodotus not to seem lenient. He does not contradict openly more aggressive stances, like Rheginus'. Rather, Theodotus sheds the 'gentler' light of didactic passages, which contain theological content where he still tries to persuade Nestorius to recant only after drawing on familiar variants and implications of the medical simile. When preaching, the preceptive component would also distance in time Theodotus' opposition to Rheginus' incitations.[228]

The *topoi* on the need to correct, to look for peace and unity in the church, and to only condemn as a last resource which Theodotus addresses in Homily III, giving it a more serene character than Rheginus', predominate in Celestine's letters to Cyril and to the council.[229] Firmus claims on 10 July, in the presence of Celestine's legates, that the council had modelled its votes on these letters,[230] but it is unclear if they had been read before the legates' arrival. Aggressive homilies, like Rheginus', may rule out or antedate the disclosure of such papal injunctions, relying on the harsher rhetoric employed, for example, in Celestine's letter to Nestorius, which had been read during the session of 22 June.[231] Cyril relied at the first session on the conditions mentioned in all of Celestine's letters, and Firmus refers foremost to this policy.

Despite the details provided by the rubrics[232] it is unclear when, where, and why longer homilies were read in Ephesus, and what their influence was. They may have been re-delivered as sermons, although unsuited for sequential preaching, or read as documents. Bishops may have asked Theodotus for a source where he expounded his thoughts more thoroughly, for example after hearing his statements or sermons. If Homilies I and II were brought to the attention of the council before Theodotus preached Homilies III or VI, the reception of Theodotus' conciliar sermons by those who knew the longer ones may have been informed by these. Homilies may have also been read to help to persuade those in doubt or questioning the conciliar decisions. Backed by the theological and rhetorical skills and reputation of the author, they exposed relevant theological and ecclesiological material and contained arguments, which were

[226] See p. 57, contrasting Juvenal and Theodotus' condemnations.

[227] I. Rucker, 'Ephesinische Konzilsakten in armenischgeorgischer Überlieferung' (1930), 83-4, points to the similarities in tone to Firmus' Homily, B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 134-7.

[228] See p. 32 for a possible pastoral background in Theodotus' 'toleration'.

[229] ACO I 1/2, 75-7 and 83-90.

[230] ACO I 1/3, 58, 1-5.

[231] *Coll. Vat.* 10 read 22 June: ACO I 1/2, 36, 12.

[232] Further discussed on p. 120.

anchored in the use of scripture, thus providing material for those who espoused similar ideas.

Homilies, especially the conciliar sermons, may have enjoyed a pamphlet-like distribution in Ephesus and beyond. Probably written down while delivered extempore, they could have been handed out and sent around both before and after they had been appended to the minutes, in the arising conciliar collections. Even 'moderate' sermons like Theodotus' contributed to the escalation of the conflict. The conciliar homilies, with their elements of praise to Cyril, encouraged and gave corroborative arguments to Cyril's supporters. Some Cyrillians developed a blind and tendentious loyalty to Cyril and his formula.[233]

Theodotus and the presence of Celestine's legates

A *sacra* arrived 6 or 7 July,[234] with the reaction of the court to the conflicting reports sent from Ephesus and to antagonistic views espoused by people in Constantinople. The emperors insisted on theological dialogue, decreed the annulment of the factionalised decisions, and demanded a single council, attended by all. Theodosius II asked for renewed investigation of everything 'without contentiousness and with regard for the truth'.[235] An 'argument of piety', as 'had been set down' was to be 'examined' and 'validated for the future',[236] and the emperors reserved for themselves the right to confirm the conciliar decision, since their rule was 'on behalf not of men [...] but of doctrine itself and truth itself'.[237] As both sides persisted in the propriety and therefore validity of their sessions, and refused to be brought together, the long stay in Ephesus continued. During this and later months the complaints about waiting gradually incorporated pastoral concerns related to prolonged absence.[238]

When the papal legates arrived, the Cyrillians staged conciliar sessions anew on Friday 10 and Saturday 11 July. Theodotus' participation again influenced the course of action, as described in the proceedings, which albeit similar in style to those of 22 June, seem less detailed. The minutes report statements and introduce documents which were read, but they name fewer participants. In the opening list of attendees, Theodotus is, in fifth place, the only metropolitan bishop named after the representatives of the major sees of Rome and Alexandria (Cyril for both), Jerusalem, Ephesus (as host) and Thessalonica.[239]

[233] L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 293.

[234] ACO I 1/3, 9-10.

[235] ACO I 1/3, 10, 18-9.

[236] ACO I 1/3, 10, 3-6.

[237] ACO I 1/3, 10, 4-6, 17-21. See also N. Russell, *The Doctrine of Deification* (2004), 51.

[238] Compare with p. 45, still echoed in ACO I 1/2, 66ff. L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 210 contrasts the waiting after the first session with the initial claims of hurry.

[239] ACO I 1/3, 53, 19-20.

The style of fewer and longer declarations, interspersed with collated interventions from the floor, may correspond to an effort to make the proceedings and minutes more conform to an apparently kinder stance of Celestine, aiming at unity through the spirit supported teaching.[240] Celestine's letter brought by the legates and read on 10 July emphasised the apostolic succession (διαδοχή) to vouchsafe the teaching whereby unity ought to be achieved with protection from the arms of faith.[241] This letter seems incongruous with the events elicited by Celestine's earlier letters to Cyril and Nestorius, and suggests that when he wrote it, he was unaware of Cyril's handling of them.[242]

All the action at the two sessions revolved around the papal legates, for whose delay understanding[243] was only cautiously expressed because 'delay' was one shortcoming being levelled against the Orientals. Firmus' reply to Projectus' possibly falsely-modest exaltation of Roman authority of teaching[244] was followed by Arcadius and Philippus' request to know what had happened, which Theodotus answered.[245]

The narrative presents Theodotus with enough authority to postpone further deliberations for the next day, so that the remainder of 10 July is left for the legates to be familiarised with the events of the Cyrillian Council, since without any further remark, the minutes end with Theodotus' statement. Adjourning had probably been planned by the fomenters of the sessions.[246]

The statement shows Theodotus' familiarity with an adequate way of addressing the legates with deference to Celestine, as well as with the technical vocabulary of proceedings and acts.[247] The 'very minutes of the proceedings' should satisfy the legates' curiosity about the proceedings. Addressing Celestine's major concerns,[248] Theodotus promises the minutes will prove the 'justice of the decree', the 'fervour of the holy council', and the 'concord of the faith'.

Theodotus' suggested postponement of the session allowed the Cyrillian leaders to inform the papal legates without witnesses or notaries registering

[240] ACO I 1/3, 57, 4ff. However, T. Graumann, 'Protokollierung, Aktenerstellung' (2010), 13, 28.

[241] ACO I 1/3, 55, 21ff., 56, 15ff, 20ff. Theodotus' Homily VI expands all these topics, but the lack of the Greek original precludes close comparison to Celestine's letter.

[242] News had not yet reached Celestine, and he would not have foreseen how his letters were used in Alexandria.

[243] ACO I 1/3, 58, 1-11.

[244] ACO I 1/3, 57, 29-34.

[245] ACO I 1/3, 58, 32 - 59, 8.

[246] This instruction warrants calling Theodotus a presiding bishops in R. Price, 'Presidency and Procedure' (2009), 243, 245.

[247] See E. Chrysos, 'Konzilsakten und Konzilsprotokolle' (1983), 31 for a largely theoretical distinction of these terms; also A. de Halleux, 'La première session du concile d'Ephèse' (1993), 50, T. Graumann, 'Protokollierung, Aktenerstellung' (2010), 21, 33. Theodotus' usage is in agreement, keeping the terms apart.

[248] 'Even if you disagree in mouth, nevertheless you shall present solely that which the Spirit itself taught', ACO I 1/3, 57, 12-3.

what was said. This private meeting may have been in Latin, and Theodotus may have been present. The council expected Roman support would enhance its pressingly needed legitimacy. It was probably the only support 'external' to Cyril's sphere of influence they could expect. Although the court did not pay more than formal heed to papal 'authority', the Cyrillian collections of conciliar documents tried to be persuasive to both Rome and the imperial court, by addressing the conditions of Celestine's earlier letter(s). The adjournment was perhaps useful to explain to the emissaries Cyril's use of Celestine's letters and their conditions. The legates probably were not informed about Nestorius' actions as reconciliatory steps which might have sufficed to satisfy Celestine's request, even if bishops like Theodotus and Acacius, having talked to Nestorius, possibly knew that he thought as much.[249]

The next day the Greek acts were read, because the legates express as duty the need to hear them in session. All members of the council who could hear this reading of the minutes would have thus become familiar with the 'official' representation of the session of 22 June. A Latin translation of the minutes is not mentioned, and it is not clear how much Greek the papal legates could understand.[250]

The extent of theological clarification offered to the legates is uncertain. It is not clear if the letters were read beyond the few lines included in the minutes. The legates have been blamed for not perceiving the significance of the 12 *kephalaia*,[251] but they may have not heard them, in Greek or translated, in Ephesus. Theological excursus may have been limited to informal discussions or preaching, but if texts like the *kephalaia* were not often re-read, parallels were less important for the audience than for later readers.

Perhaps the arrival of the papal legates brought some assurance, echoed as a 'certain calm' in Acacius of Melitene's sermon,[252] which may be therefore dated between 11 and 16 July. Theodotus' Homily VI may also be dated after 10 July, if the exegesis of *Matt.* 16:18 alludes to the presence of papal legates, but its emphasis on the fight for the faith[253] does not suggest this is a moment of certain calm, rather, of apprehension.

Theodotus' participation in later developments in Ephesus is difficult to trace, and the scant evidence may suggest that his influence diminished considerably.

[249] L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 196, whose interpretation explores this extensively, and assumes Nestorius had, already, the opinion expressed in the later *Heracl.*, and had cared to state it.

[250] They spoke Latin during the sessions, possibly to highlight their role as papal legates representing the West, even if they were proficient in Greek.

[251] *Cf.* A. de Halleux, 'Les douze chapitres cyrilliens au concile' (1992), 425f., L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 245. Rome seems to have ignored them for another century, although they were probably contained in one of the appended documents presented to the legates and sent to Rome.

[252] ACO I 1/2, 90, 13, B.M. Weischer, Qēerellos 4.1 (1979), 38.

[253] B.M. Weischer, Qēerellos 4.1 (1979), 132, 3.

The minutes of the sessions of 16 and 17 July[254] do not name him. Even the list of names stops with Flavian of Philippi, after whom Theodotus was often named in other lists. These sessions, conducted by Juvenal, deposed John of Antioch and the Orientals *in absentia* by the same argument Nestorius had been deposed, for refusing three summons. The proceedings echo the technicality of the 'legal' nature of the decisions of the Cyrillian session of 22 June and of the Orientals' minutes. Cyril and Memnon no longer presided over the sessions, but were a central driving force by their *libellus*, read at the session. There was room for other bishops to stand out, and, for example, Acacius of Melitene was often named.[255] Theodotus' likely unremarkable participation may have been due to Cyril not leading the session, or the approach adopted extending the sanctions and condemnations to groups and not to few individuals. Theodotus is also not mentioned in the hardly reliably documented later sessions, such as on 22 and 31 July.[256]

At the beginning of August 431, the *comes sacrarum largitionum* John brought the *sacra* to 'the council',[257] where Theodotus is 'accidentally' named first among the 'Greek-speaking' bishops.[258] The court accepted the decisions of both sides ignoring the existence of opposite councils, and John had instruction to put the deposed bishops Nestorius, Cyril and Memnon under arrest.[259] Juvenal led the assembly after Cyril's deposition, and later also the delegation to the emperor.[260] Theodotus' continued involvement with the council is attested by the letters he signed in a prominent position, fitting for his see, and later as a member of the delegation to the court. He was part of the effort to see the recognition of the Cyrillian session of 22 June as a sufficient solution to the 'Nestorius problem' and the unacceptability of any Oriental decision, and he may have preached for this cause.

The Cyrillians turned to the same media as before to reverse the tide brought about by *comes* John's presence. They wrote letters and sent minutes to the outside world and reached out to those in Ephesus delivering sermons. The argument of receiving and transmitting teaching which predominated in the Roman participation in the session of 10 July was added by the Cyrillians to the main themes of the session of 22 June, centred on the affiliation to the authority of the fathers while aiming to present themselves as authoritative.

[254] *Coll. Vat.* 87-90, ACO I 1/3, 15, 26.

[255] His participation is exemplified in the lengthy eloquent request to see John of Antioch charged, as leader of the defection (ACO I 1/3, 17, 10-9).

[256] ACO I 1/7, 118f., see T. Graumann, 'Protokollierung, Aktenerstellung' (2010), 23, 26, 33.

[257] ACO I 1/3, 31f.

[258] The exceptional ordering has been convincingly explained by scribal practice of copying in columns a list of three columns made to be read in lines in A.M. Crabbe, 'The invitation list' (1981).

[259] ACO I 1/7, 68.

[260] E. Honigmann, 'Juvenal of Jerusalem' (1950), 224.

They expanded the celebration of Cyril from the concordance of his letter with Nicene faith to the identification of his teaching as authoritative. They explained to the emperors that the 'council' had not deposed Cyril and Memnon, 'rather admires these men for their zeal for orthodoxy and deems them worthy of much praise from men and from many crowns from Christ the lord'.[261] The brief letters which both councils sent in answer to the *sacra* John brought presented selective narratives. They avoided detailing the theological problems, which no constraints of adequacy and genre would have impeded. Instead of exactness, proposition and solution,[262] many interpretational possibilities were left to the audience, adaptable to varied and changeable ears, such as the recipients afar at the court, where no one in Ephesus knew with certainty what was happening.[263]

While the Orientals insisted on Nestorius' reinstatement and attacked the 12 *kephalaia*,[264] the Cyrillians rallied round Cyril's authority and upheld his teachings. The conciliar homilies Cyril preached before his arrest may have been read.[265] The preaching bishops praised Cyril more or less explicitly and exalted the qualities, such as the accuracy of the teaching, with which his leadership and authority could be explained and defended. During this period, Theodotus may have preached to encourage the unity and firmness of the bishops.[266] Such preaching on unity, linking their actions to the uprightness of their conciliar decision, may have prepared them to resist the imperial exhortation to disband.[267] Should Theodotus' Homily VI postdate the arrival of *Coll. Vat.* 93, his preaching would be a clear defiance of the content of an imperial *sacra*, coming from someone who elsewhere digresses on the authority of a *sacra* as exemplar.[268] In the collections, the assertions of praise of the leaders of the council, primarily Cyril, were supported by other texts, and sermons like Theodotus' contain some of the most vehement expressions.

Delegations to the emperor

Theodotus was a member of the Cyrillian delegation which went to the imperial court, attending the emperor's request that representatives of both parties meet in

[261] ACO I 1/3, 32, 30-2. For a discussion of the image of the 'crown', see p. 134.

[262] ἡ ἀκριβὴς τῆς ἀληθείας ζήτησις: ACO I 1/1, 120, 21, κατὰ πρότασίν τε καὶ λύσιν: ACO I 1/1, 120, 23.

[263] L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 232.

[264] *Cf.* A. de Halleux, 'Les douze chapitres cyrilliens au concile' (1992), 447f.

[265] *Cf.* S. Wessel, 'Nestorius, Mary and controversy' (1999), 1-4, *ead.*, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004), 191-2, widely accepting the circumstantial information in the rubrics of Cyril's homilies. The texts, even of Cyril *Hom. div.* 7, lack specific references to events in Ephesus.

[266] B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 132.

[267] ACO I 1/3, 31, 28.

[268] See p. 165.

Constantinople. The delegations were redirected to Chalcedon, without going to the capital. Emperor, court and senate arrived in Chalcedon on 11 September.[269]

The opposing councils had already met at *comes* John's lodgings in August, refusing to dialogue.[270] There is no detailed narrative of the actions of the embassies, and Theodotus' participation is hardly mentioned.[271] The reports in letters from the Orientals[272] seem more informative than the Cyrillian sources, where in the extremely succinct account about Nestorius' 'exile' and the ordination of Maximian is a narrative about the bishops' actions in Constantinople which resembles wishful thinking. It mentions 'parties' (μέρους), but speaks of only one council. It portrays the emperor approving the Cyrillian decision after receiving their assurance of having proceeded well.[273] In contrast, the Orientals' sources[274] describe how a report 'that Acacius' mention of a passible godhead upset the emperor encouraged the Easterners but in the end the results were inconclusive'.[275]

Theodotus' choice as one of the delegates was probably related primarily to his rank, but his education and theology may have contributed. All delegates were or represented important metropolitans, enhancing the authoritative self-representation of the Cyrillian Council as valid. When the deputies for the Cyrillian Council are listed, the names follow the hierarchy of the dioceses they represent, and generally do not reflect their leadership at the sessions or in the delegation.[276] For example, Acacius of Melitene is listed after Theodotus of Ancyra, even if the minutes of the later sessions record no participation by Theodotus but important interventions by Acacius. The lists of addressers and addressees of the successive letters, sent back and forth between the delegation at the court and the council in Ephesus, have a few differences in the composition

[269] ACO I 1/7, 77, 4. By 1 September, Nestorius had already received notice (ACO I 4, 64) that his renunciation of the see of Constantinople had been accepted, and he could return to the 'monastery' of Euproprius, near Antioch, a fact which the Cyrillians rephrase as an imperial exile/banishment of Nestorius, *cf.* ACO I 1/3, 67, 5.

[270] ACO I 1/7, 67, 22-3, J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 102.

[271] When shortly after the council, John of Antioch faced opposing arguments and preaching in Ancyra (probably by Theodotus), he recalled the events in Ephesus, Chalcedon and Constantinople (*seditionis*), singling Theodotus out by name alongside Firmus (ACO I 4, 80, 3-5). His account is sufficient to suggest that Theodotus was proactively supporting Cyril and causing problems for the Orientals.

[272] ACO I 1/7, 71-77.

[273] ACO I 1/3, 67, 1-9, and passages from letters between Cyrillian bishops and delegates (ACO I 1/7, 72 confirming ACO I 1/3, 65).

[274] ACO I 1/7, 77, 23-6.

[275] N. Russell, *The Doctrine of Deification* (2004), 51. ACO I 1/7, 142, 24-6, and on Acacius' absurdities, ACO I 1/7, 77, 23-6. Furthermore, when John of Antioch names only Theodotus and Firmus in his reference to the Cyrillian delegates (ACO I 4, 80, 3), he may have not mentioned Acacius deliberately.

[276] ACO I 1/7, 72, 4-5. C.f. ACO I 1/2, 13ff., ACO I 1/2, 31ff. See p. 54, 57.

of the embassy.[277] Not only the order changes, but while in *Coll. Ath.* 59 the bishop Arcadius is listed as the legate for the metropolitan bishop of Rome, in *Coll. Vat.* 108 it is the priest Philip. The main-matter document suggests that the delegations were essentially letter-bearers, as understood in late antiquity.[278] When needed, bishops travelled back and forth to transmit sensitive or trustworthy information,[279] to contribute where most needed, or to be refrained from causing more problems.

Foreseeing potential theological discussions, it probably helped that Theodotus had already displayed good spokesmanship for Cyril and his ideas. The Cyrillian bishops ought to have expected the Orientals wanting to discuss the 12 *kephalaia*, as it apparently happened in Chalcedon.[280] Knowledge of Latin seems to have been an asset, even if emperor and court were probably ready to listen to them in Greek, or had translators at hand.[281] Theodotus met all these requirements, but it was Acacius who came to be known as the chief spokesmen for the Cyrillians, to rival Theodoret of Cyrrhus, for the Orientals.[282] Nevertheless, the actions of the Cyrillian delegates in Chalcedon in their refusal at all cost of any theological dispute, as portrayed in the extant (Oriental) narratives,[283] echo markedly Theodotus' views on avoidance of reasoning about the religious mysteries.

Conciliar events like the delegations perhaps gave Theodotus a successful example of refusal of discussion about theological matters helping to uphold a view, one which he already defended before the council. Theodotus' way of expressing the relation of faith and reasoning may, at later stages of the council, have seemed less suitable than, for example, specifying criticism on words and sophisms,[284] especially when addressing the emperor who insisted on examination of matters of faith. Theodotus' works contain few echoes of later Cyrillian documents. When themes, which are largely absent[285] from early conciliar documents, occur, Theodotus uses a different vocabulary, as is the case of the improper use in theological matters of word tricks and sophism.[286] Theodotus is less likely to have contributed to penning later documents of the Cyrillian Council, which resemble his works less than, for example, *Coll. Vat.* 85 did.

[277] See also I. Rucker, 'Ephesinische Konzilsakten in armenischgeorgischer Überlieferung' (1930), 75-81.

[278] P. Allen, 'Prolegomena to a study of the letter-bearer' (2013).

[279] There is little information on servants, priests and other aides. B. Neil *et al.* (eds), *Preaching Poverty* (2009), 46.

[280] ACO I 4, 64-71. See also L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 238-40.

[281] Arcadius and Juvenal were fluent in Latin. For Theodotus, see p. 110, and F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), 205-7.

[282] ACO I 1/7, 77, 23-6, N. Russell, *Cyril* (2000), 51.

[283] ACO I 4, 69-70.

[284] ACO I 1/3, 47, 26-7.

[285] M. Simonetti, 'Alcune osservazioni sul monofisismo di Cirillo' (1982), 494.

[286] *E.g.* M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 226, 1-5 and ACO I 1/3, 47-8.

Theodotus returns to Ancyra

Maximian, consecrated metropolitan of Constantinople 25 October 431, assembled a synod. The resulting documents contain signatures of most signatories of the letters sent by the Cyrillian delegation, including Theodotus.[287] In the Cyrillian sources, the events concerning the delegations and the ordination of Nestorius' successor are largely conflated. John of Antioch mentions Theodotus' virulent anti-Orientals efforts,[288] and Acacius of Beroea claims that when Theodosius II allowed members of the delegations to enter Constantinople for the enthronement of the new bishop, Maximian led a crowd of monks which impeded the entry of Oriental delegates.[289] It is unclear if Theodotus' or other members of any delegation returned to Ephesus before the bishops were again allowed to return home.[290] Some, like Cyril, left Ephesus before the emperors allowed it, apparently escaping custody with bribes.[291] Thus, Theodotus may not have met Cyril again after September 431.

If earlier the emperor had only exhorted the bishops to go home in 'peace and harmony' keeping in mind the canonical and dogmatic outcome of the council,[292] which he thought had already been achieved,[293] at the final dismissal, the bishops were sent with clear instructions to resort to 'what is written' if there is not 'peaceful intention'.[294] The conciliar decisions were corroborated by imperial laws.[295] These letters had a normative function providing official backing for further actions,[296] but contained few details about the events in Ephesus. A bishop returning to his see probably spoke about the council and its outcome. The wider public would hardly have other sources of authoritative information,[297] and some imperial letters suggest a continuous limited knowledge about details of the councils beyond the walls of Ephesus and the courtly

[287] ACO I 1/7, 138, 31.

[288] ACO I 4, 80, 3-5.

[289] ACO I 4, 85, 35 - 86, 2.

[290] ACO I 1/7, 142, 19-33.

[291] Bribes: F. Nau (ed.), *Le Livre d'Héraclide de Damas* (1910), 249. Cyril's triumphant welcome in Alexandria ACO I 1/3, 67, 1-9. See N. Russell, *The Doctrine of Deification* (2004), 51, J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 107.

[292] ACO I 1/3, 31, 27-8.

[293] ACO I 1/3, 31, 24.

[294] ACO I 1/7, 142, 30-1.

[295] *E.g.* ACO I 1/3, 67, 13ff.

[296] John of Antioch gives evidence of Theodotus' active involvement in writing and preaching which continued the pattern of reciprocal excommunications, ACO I 4, 80, 4-17.

[297] However, the location of Ancyra on the main highway to Antioch makes it probable that Oriental documents were also circulated there, or that narrative accounts from their perspective could have been heard. For example, John of Antioch's presence in Ancyra, shortly after the council (attested in ACO I 4, 79-80) may have allowed him, and perhaps others, to make their point of view known.

palaces.[298] In principle, the bishops were expected to abide by and enforce imperial laws in their dioceses. However, some bishops continued to incite enmity between the parties. The pattern of reciprocal excommunications persisted and Theodotus was deposed at the Synod of Tarsus, for example.[299] For one, John of Antioch complained of the attacks in writing and preaching which he faced on his return to his see.[300] John's letter is a complex piece of evidence, and presents a rhetorical multifaceted construction of the situation in Ancyra.[301] Thus, it is not a good source for detailed inferences, but is enough to notice that after the Council of Ephesus, polemical preaching was supplemented by the circulation of defamatory writings. Texts later included in the conciliar collections, such as Theodotus' homilies, may have been distributed and read across the provinces. Furthermore, John's letter suggests the likely scenario for Theodotus' theological treatises, which he probably wrote after the year 431. The next paragraphs delineate the relation of the two works with the conciliar ideas and the post-conciliar church-political developments.

Theodotus' *Expositio symboli Nicaeni* brought together his opposition to Nestorius, and his view on the foundations of faith, as expressed in his conciliar statements and homilies. The first part of the treatise is an attack against Nestorian views condemned at Ephesus, founded on a staunch defence of accepting the Nicene creed 'as it is', without any change or interpretational addition.[302] Besides scripture, the faith ought to rely on the authority of the fathers. Credal formulae,[303] especially the Nicene creed, carry the strength of collective and 'unanimous' assent. The treatise contains an explicit description of the authority of the Nicene creed,[304] as made of the words with which the fathers expounded the faith about the only-begotten, which direct (διορθούμενοι) all human reflection (ἐπίνοια), as a canon (κανών). Theodotus expands the idea of guidance by exploring the meaning of κανών, between its material and its metaphorical content. The creed is a λόγος which straightens the understanding (ἔννοια) of the human beings, whose ἐπίνοια wants to divert (διαστρέφω) the faith. As in Homily II, Theodotus explores the fluid boundary between text and its content.[305] In the treatise, citations and references to scripture abound, and the exegesis is largely similar to what Theodotus presented in homilies. In

[298] Eye-witnesses could see incongruities between ACO I 1/3, 67, 1-9 and ACO I 1/7, 71-77, for example.

[299] ACO I 4, 194.

[300] ACO I 4, 80, 3-5.

[301] See L.M. Frenkel, '"Dear prefect, Stop the ill rumour!"' (perhaps 2014).

[302] T. Graumann, *Die Kirche der Väter* (2002), 403-5.

[303] A. Weckwerth, *Ablauf, Organisation und Selbstverständnis westlicher antiker Synoden* (2007), 26 footnote 119.

[304] PG77, 1324C-5B.

[305] H.-J. Sieben, 'Zur Entwicklung der Konzilsidee' (1973), 29-30.

Adversus Nestorium,[306] Theodotus refutes a selection of Nestorian passages slightly different of what Cyril addresses in the first two books of *Contra Nestorium*.[307] This is possibly the clearest indication of his dissociation from Cyril. The open praise of the bishop of Alexandria is restricted to Theodotus' conciliar homilies. Perhaps, the two treatises against Nestorius were written independently, but Theodotus may have written his refutation of Nestorian excerpts instead of just circulating Cyril's treatise and letters. Perhaps, theological differences to Cyril's ideas, to his approach or the way he expressed them motivated Theodotus.

A fragment of a letter, preserved in Latin, bears a rubric which identifies it as sent by Theodotus to Vitale. The text deals with the spread of questions and doubts in Cilicia, especially in Tyana. The writer laments that the simple religiosity of monastic life be troubled by doctrinal novelties, resembling Cyril *Ad monachos*.[308] As in most of Theodotus' extant works, reasoning about theological matters is considered detrimental to the advantageous faith in the miraculous economy.[309] The letter fragment is forthrightly related to the controversy around Eutherius of Tyana *Antilogia*.[310] Apparently, he had been deposed by Maximian early in 432,[311] in what has been described as a clear indication of Constantinopolitan meddling in provinces traditionally not under its influence. The fragment ascribed to Theodotus adds evidence to the support Eutherius enjoyed in his diocese, which helped him to retain his see for a while.[312]

[306] A. van Roey, 'Le florilège nestorien dans le «Traité contre Nestorius»' (1975), 157. The text survives in Syriac translation in fragmentary manuscripts, still to be edited.

[307] ACO I 1/6, 13-52.

[308] ACO I 4, 212, 13-5. On Cyril *Ep.* 1: ACO I 1/1, 11; *cf.* S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004), 77-8.

[309] ACO I 4, 212, 15-18; *cf.* p. 175.

[310] M. Tetz, *Eine Antilogie des Eutherios von Tyana* (1964), usually dated to 432. The work is also know as *Confutationes quarundam propositionum*. In F.E. Sciuto, *Un episodio sconosciuto della controversia cristologica* (1984), 116ff., taking for granted that conciliar documents circulated widely in Ephesus and after the Council, that Theodotus' homilies were among the texts, and that the same can be assumed for *Exp. symb.*, the scholar suggests that Eutherius' attacks were directed foremost against Theodotus, and not against Cyril's views. Until both of Theodotus' theological treatises are carefully analysed, it seems more likely that Eutherius' attacks of Cyril's views reflect an Oriental criticism, and that Theodotus' works represent an attempt to make Cyril's ideas known to an Oriental audience, and therefore both dwell longer on topics such as *Philippians* 2.

[311] Cyril refers to a no longer extant letter of deposition in his correspondence with John of Antioch (ACO I 1/7, 153, 19ff.).

[312] Theodoret describes a failed attempt to enthrone a successor, involving Firmus of Cæsarea and Longras, the imperial officer in command of the Isaurian troops (ACO I 4, 87, 22-32). Eventually, Eutherius was banished to Scythopolis for his repudiation of the Formula of Reunion, and fled to Tyr, where he died (ACO I 4, 204, 3-5). On the complex patterns of support beyond provincial and diocesan boundaries, see N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 82.

In the letter fragment, two aspects stand out. First, that the writer adopts a heretic succession which starts with Theodore of Mopsuestia, Nestorius comes second, and Eutherius (actually, all in the diocese of Tyana) is the most recent proponent of impious questions.[313] Secondly, that it implies that a monk in Cilicia thought it fitting to direct to Theodotus of Ancyra problems related to the spread of ideas from Tyana in Cappadocia Secunda. It implies a connection with monasticism, an awareness of ongoing theological disputations, and the use of heresiology that echoes Cyril's move against Theodore, which are not attested so clearly elsewhere in the sources about Theodotus.

The last document related to Theodotus during his lifetime is a letter by Cyril addressed to Acacius of Melitene. Only one manuscript mentions also Theodotus, alongside Firmus, as recipients.[314] Perhaps, Theodotus had a limited participation in the networking which Cyril was trying to enhance,[315] even if Theodotus was not a regular addressee with Cyril or anyone else. It is possible that Cyril actually kept Theodotus informed of many events by forwarding to him relevant texts, such as this letter where he describes the reaction of the Antiochene synod. Another possibility is that Theodotus actually supported Cyril steadily and unquestioningly, despite their differences and Cyril was spared the trouble of addressing Theodotus' particular objections.[316] It seems that Theodotus was not a regular correspondent with any major player of the post-conciliar theological debate. This could seem typical of most bishops who attended the Council of Ephesus, who are only mentioned in the acts. However, it is atypical for the metropolitans who influenced the course of action of the Cyrillian Council as much as Theodotus. He seems to distance himself from Cyril once he returned to Ancyra. Perhaps he had his own church-political or theological agenda. Theodotus' tendency towards monophysitism did not lead Ancyra to become a monophysite diocese.[317] Alexandrian influence in Galatia receded and Ancyra was eventually encroached by the Constantinopolitan sphere of influence.[318] Perhaps, Theodotus' statements of uneasiness with divisive attitudes which at the council met the imperial interests, would have suited the so-called regional

[313] ACO I 4, 212, 12-3, 18-9.

[314] ACO I 4, 231, 28, and the pertinent critical apparatus. Also PG77, 337C, J.A. Fabricius *et al.*, *Bibliotheca Graeca 9* (1804), 585, M. Jugie (ed.), *Homélies mariales* (1926), 289, and C. Lupus and T.A. Filippini, *Ad Ephesinum Concilium* (1726), 373. Also transmitted in *Coll. Diosc.* 30 (*Vat.* 1431) – without mentioning Theodotus – it was included in editions of Theodoret's works like J.L. Schulze, *B. Theodoreti Episcopi Cyri Opera omnia* (1774), 880.

[315] T. Graumann, 'Kirchliche Identität und bischöfliche Selbstinszenierung' (2003).

[316] Contrasting situations are at the root of Cyril's letters to Acacius (*Ep.* 40, ACO I 1/4, 20-31) and Succensus (*Ep.* 45, ACO I 1/6, 151-7 and *Ep.* 46, ACO I 1/6, 157-62), for example. See also H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 534.

[317] See the negative evidence of E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites* (1951), where the only mention of Ancyra is on p. 151 concerning a letter by Justinian reaffirming the Chalcedonian faith.

[318] P. Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople, 451-491* (2006), 296, 316, 780-1.

propensity for accommodation and tolerance which may have continued to characterise Theodotus' Ancyran audience. Cyril, however, soon gave up the diplomatic reaction to an Antiochene synodical letter[319] as expressed in the letter to Acacius, for a campaign against Theodore of Mopsuestia.[320]

It is possible that Theodotus' receding participation during the later sessions of Ephesus I indicates that he looked not only in words but also in actions for conciliation by the avoidance of dissension and of debate. John's letter and the fragment to Vitale, mentioned above, seems to contradict this. Clearly, the pieces of evidence are too few, but comparisons of Theodotus' and Acacius' conciliar participation present some clues with which to close this section.

The documentation and reception of the Council of Ephesus was much influenced by subsequent events leading to Chalcedon, and by the consolidation of regional theological differences.[321] Both Theodotus and Acacius of Melitene died before the Council of Chalcedon. Acacius' role in church history is much better documented. In the decade after the council he remained visible in ecclesiastic matters, first as a supporter of Cyril, later as a critic of what he saw as Cyril's retreat, conceding too much to the Antiochene views. It is not known how Theodotus reacted to the Formula of 433,[322] the documents in its wake, or the imperial laws against Nestorius.[323] Compared to Theodotus, Acacius' works suggest a worse rhetorician, and in his lifetime he seemed a less subtle church leader since he stirred up considerably the Christological divisions in the build-up to Chalcedon, in part getting involved with the questions raised by the Armenian church.[324] Acacius' interventions gave rise to some of the foundational texts of Chalcedonian orthodoxy, such as Proclus *Tomus ad Armenios*[325] and Cyril *Epistula* 40. Theodotus left works which tend to express a more acute monophysitism than Cyril's without contributing much to the development of doctrine. His preaching and the circulation of his writings apparently increased anti-Oriental tensions in Galatia, and led to the reputation of a staunch anti-Nestorian which a close scrutiny of his conciliar participation can disprove only partially.

No personal legacy or discipleship is attested. All references to Theodotus of Ancyra are literary.[326] Apart from the compilation and reception of conciliar

[319] Non-extant letter of a synod in Antioch, August 438.

[320] T. Jansen, *Theodor von Mopsuestia, De Incarnatione* (2009), 29.

[321] T. Graumann, 'Towards the reception of the Council of Ephesus' (2010).

[322] ACO I 1/4, 15-20; *cf.* J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 114ff.

[323] *E.g.* ACO I 1/3, 67. For example, depending on the date of his *Adversus Nestorium*, Theodotus may have continued to use Nestorius' name to personify heterodox Christology despite the ban circulated in 436 (ACO I 1/3, 68). For the date, see also ACO I 1/4, xi and L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 275.

[324] N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 99ff.

[325] ACO IV 2, 187-195.

[326] Discussed in greater detail on pp. 118-26.

documentation, Theodotus seems to have been championed first among monophysite Christians, especially in Syriac translation. Indeed, it is difficult to trace Theodotus' influence because a substantial part of the evidence is in Latin, Syriac, Ethiopic and Arabic translations, or in glosses of Greek manuscripts, all materials which are not contemplated by databases like the TLG. Textual searches nevertheless suggest a reduced number of references of his name and even fewer attributed quotations throughout Byzantine literature, hinting that he was considered only a secondary figure in Greek Orthodoxy.[327]

Theodotus' sermons

This section analyses Homilies III and VI closely, as a case study of conciliar sermons, highlighting their intrinsic relation to the synod. Allegedly, Theodotus preached them to the gathered synod, and thus, they are better suited to discuss the role of sermons during the synod than Homilies I and II, only said to have been read to the council. The circumstances of this redelivery are vague, and apparently did not affect their content. Theodotus' brief conciliar sermons are representative of his thought, since he at least alludes in them to most themes in his other homilies, to which the final chapter again resorts, to discuss theological matters.

The first chapter presented a broad picture of the time and space in which Theodotus lived, and the previous sections, a detailed analysis of his participation in the Council of Ephesus, and possible scenarios for preaching. So that particularly noteworthy individual passages for the relation of the homilies to the conciliar setting can be analysed in the next chapter – highlighting the conciliar issues to be answered in its last sections by an analysis of aspects of Theodotus' theological and ecclesiological thought – it is necessary to describe and discuss here aspects of the homiletics of this period which are relevant for Theodotus' two conciliar homilies. The problematic liturgical setting will be discussed first, after a brief summary correlated to the task at hand.

Theodotus is particularly well represented in the body of Ephesian conciliar homilies with both homilies first delivered in Ephesus, and earlier ones, which are said to have been read in Ephesus to the Council. The *Coll. Vat.* also includes a pre-conciliar sermon of Proclus who did not participate in the council,[328] as well as sermons said to have been held in Ephesus by several Cyrillian bishops, such as Acacius, Rheginus, and, of course, Cyril himself.[329] The minutes of the sessions record a significant engagement of these leading

[327] See pp. 124-6.

[328] ACO I 1/1, 103-7. See p. 12, 43, 76.

[329] Homilies in other major Greek collections of conciliar documents are discussed on p. 121ff., and briefly in N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 71, 126ff.

bishops. *Coll. Vat.* is typical of those compilations where only a few sermons were juxtaposed to letters and decrees while focusing on the minutes and appended documents.[330] Other Greek collections, transmitted solely in late antique or medieval translations,[331] sometimes were built almost entirely around homilies, and included also the contribution of bishops less active during the sessions[332] and a wider range of texts prior to the council.[333] Thus, Theodotus' sermons and read homilies are representative of an intrinsic feature of late antique conciliar proceedings which is not mentioned in the minutes of the sessions, whose importance cannot be fully grasped from the few references in letters. These show that also the Orientals preached during the conciliar period, although the evidence is scarce.[334]

Preaching and the engagement with earlier sermons – admittedly through 'public' reading – was an important venture during the months in Ephesus, to which a significant number of bishops contributed. Theodotus' sermons in Ephesus need to be interpreted in the wider context of the entire conflict,[335] while at the same time their distinct character stems from the direct and very practical link with the council's work at the time.[336] Preaching was a polemical activity considering the obstacles to liturgical activities, and the inherent importance of arguments like the validity of teaching and communion.[337] Exploring one more communication platform and its intrinsic qualities, sermons allowed more extended presentation and recapitulation of the theological topics being debated during conciliar sessions than the statements therein[338] as well as advocacy for the bishops' self-presentation as conciliar fathers and the validity of their proceedings.[339] The preaching bishop could address directly an audience, possibly wider than at the sessions, while referring to liturgical elements like venue, scriptural readings, hymns and hagiography.[340] The written versions

[330] E. Chrysos, 'Konzilsakten und Konzilsprotokolle' (1983), 32, F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), 237, E. Schwartz, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum* (1914ff.), vii; *id.*, *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431* (1927), 94, T. Graumann, *Die Kirche der Väter* (2002), 399, and p. 75ff.

[331] *E.g.* Ethiopic and Georgian translations – resp. B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), I. Rucker, 'Ephesinische Konzilsakten in armenischgeorgischer Überlieferung' (1930).

[332] *E.g.* Eusebius of Herakleia, B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 100-7.

[333] *E.g.* Epiphanius Constantiensis, B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 23, B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.2 (1979).

[334] P. 48. *Cf.* ACO IV 1, 132, 35 - 133, 11 (Constantinople II, *Actio V*, 101-2). On Nestorius' preaching, see L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 32ff., S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004), 242-52.

[335] *Cf.* insights gained from this perspective into Proclus' sermonising in N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 40-76.

[336] P. 94.

[337] Respectively, p. 55, 64.

[338] *E.g.* ACO I 1/2, 38.

[339] *Cf.* p. 50, 75.

[340] *Cf.* pp. 97, 100, 150.

preserved many circumstantial details, in spite of having been readied to be circulated among audiences unaware of details of the original setting.[341]

Analogous to the endorsement and promotion of Cyril *Epistula* 2 in the 22 June session, Theodotus and Acacius, for example, argued for the existence of leadership in their homilies, praising Cyril, and commending his teaching.[342] The homilies differ in the choice of themes and arguments,[343] possibly related to the personal interests of the preacher,[344] although the imbalance of scarce texts and abundant complex variables disallows definite conclusions. The homilies testify to the complexity of the conciliar setting, confirm that the Cyrillian minutes provide a partial picture, and further indicate the rhetorical effort behind the quite harmonious and optimistic view which the conciliar factions wanted to spread in their letters and treatises.

The following analysis of Theodotus' conciliar sermons, in illuminating their setting, rhetorical qualities, purposes and main themes, constantly relates them to examples from other preachers, to texts emanating from the sessions, to letters written during the conciliar period and to some evidence of non-episcopal involvement with the Ephesian conciliar events. Existing examinations of Proclus' and Cyril's sermons[345] have highlighted in particular that exploring standard images and arguments from both late antique oratory and the theology inhered from the fourth-century debates, the preachers attempted to denigrate the soundness of the opponents' teaching, uphold their own, defend their (living or dead) paragons, and especially place their endeavours in the sanctioned tradition of the church, and thus relate to the divine world-order, in which they could place their duties, and allude to divine prophecies and promises.

Conciliar homilies contain only seemingly precise references to the conflict, open to various interpretations, leaving explicit associations to historical events tentative. Studying the homilies underscores that the theological vocabulary was not 'a separate expression of [...] devotion',[346] but part of the polemic. However, Proclus' homilies lack the immediacy of the conciliar context, in both audience and content, and Cyril's sermons have been shown to be primarily invective discourses. The careful reading of a wider range of conciliar homilies exemplifies the fluidity of generic boundaries, [347] since although their content

[341] *Cf.* pp. 100, 109.

[342] B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 124, 12, ACO I 1/2, 90, 13-20, and below, p. 131ff.

[343] Noteworthily, Theodotus does not mention Mary in the conciliar homilies, reinforcing that it was not a mandatory argument in the Christological debate, an insight largely lost when passages are deprived of the wider context, as in Mariological studies. *Cf.* S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004), 224ff., R. Caro, *La homilética mariana griega* (1972), 158. Further, p. 13.

[344] *Cf.* p. 76.

[345] *Cf.* p. 12.

[346] S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004), 224.

[347] P. 99, 147.

and style have parallels in other homilies,[348] they are hardly encompassed by any general definition of homilies, even those which have been adapted to the broad late antique spectrum.[349] Placed in the historical context, and approached as an oral or written tool for theological persuasion, Theodotus' homilies share several images and objectives with other genres, especially letters.[350] Against this background, his preaching may be described as a reflection both of the council's self-presentation and continued struggle for acceptance, and as offering a specific perspective on this struggle that shows Theodotus' position among and relation to the Cyrillians, and his main pastoral interests which appear as a constant throughout his homiletic activity, before the council in Ancyra as much as in the presence of the assembled bishops in Ephesus. It raises some questions related to his theological preoccupations, which Chapter 3 addresses, keeping the conciliar setting in mind.

The evidence on the liturgical setting: audience and venue

The rubric of Homily III has the most complete information about a setting in which Theodotus preached:[351]

Homily by Theodotus of Ancyra, pronounced in Ephesus against Nestorius, in the church of John the Evangelist.

It suggests that Theodotus' Homily III was delivered at the church of John the Evangelist,[352] which was most probably the 'great church', a venue Cyril too used for preaching. This seems to imply a change of location from the conciliar session in the church of Mary.[353] However, some of the short conciliar homilies seem to have been delivered there, for example those of Juvenal of Jerusalem[354] and of Severus of Synada.[355] Their Ethiopic sources claim that these two homilies, like Theodotus' Homily VI, were preached on 5 July. Therefore, Theodotus perhaps also preached in this church. However, the incipits in the quite late *Qērellos* collection are to be treated with caution. The collector of what became the Ethiopic collection may have supplied information about the venue resorting to the church of Mary, often mentioned in the minutes, and by the time of compilation more famous, even introducing conflict with the Greek collation.[356] These rubrics raise additional questions about the state of completion and liturgical

[348] *Cf.* B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 21ff., N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 148ff.
[349] P. 9.
[350] P. 73.
[351] ACO I 1/2, 71, 21-2.
[352] The information could also refer to the liturgy. See the section on p. 96.
[353] P. 49.
[354] B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 82.
[355] B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 62.
[356] ACO I 1/2, 94, 23.

functionality of the church of Mary in Ephesus and the trustworthiness of documents locating the sessions in the great church called after Mary.[357]

Other conciliar documents add no information to allow many considerations about the type of liturgy in which Theodotus gave Homilies III and VI. Their scriptural quotations refer to questions raised at the council, and are to be found in texts read or mentioned at the session of 22 June.[358] In liturgies closely related to the council, the readings possibly incorporated some of these passages. Theodotus' allusion to them does not require this, and does not suggest that they were coincidentally prescribed readings for the day.

In Homily VI.1,[359] Theodotus represents Cyril (the 'precious stone') in the centre of the choir of fathers. It is one more image in a rich passage, and so it is not certain that this corresponds to what was going on physically in the church, but it might suggest a concentric arrangement of the bishops, with Cyril the leading celebrant of the liturgy in the centre. However, Memnon, as metropolitan of Ephesus and joint Cyrillian leader, probably presided over major liturgical celebrations.

Audience

Because of the titles and vocatives used ('fathers', 'rocks of the church'),[360] the audience of Homily VI must at least in part have consisted of bishops, even if Theodotus could include other people in that liturgical setting among the fighters for the faith, which is how he praises the audience.[361] Opponents to the majoritarian council were probably not in the audience, since a common initial reaction to theological differences was to refrain from communion, and, anyway, the bishops of different parties had shunned and been shunned from reciprocal liturgies.[362] If most Cyrillian bishops were in the audience, they probably left little or no room where Theodotus' preaching could be heard by others. In a

[357] See p. 49.

[358] See the section on p. 127.

[359] B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 122, 9f.

[360] More precisely, in Homily VI, B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 122, the audience are at first 'sons'. Their crown is the 'choir of fathers' that may refer particularly to the participants of the Council of Nicaea. The emphasis on the collective strength of the audience expands the 'assembly' or 'choir' of 'fathers' to the group of bishops gathered for the sake of an ecumenical council. Then, when Theodotus addresses the audience as 'pure fathers' – B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 124, 14 –, he means members of a council who rank alongside the Nicene fathers.

[361] The evidence for popular involvement (p. 74ff.) makes it possible that a small fraction of the Ephesian population was at this celebration, and that their active, and often aggressive support would make this general address the more fitting. See A. de Halleux, 'La première session du concile d'Ephèse' (1993), 61 for the presence of monks during the conciliar period in Ephesus.

[362] P. 48.

Cyrillian audience, Theodotus' openly stated theological views were 'orthodox' with a faith which agreed with that of the fathers of Nicaea, and with what the bishops had agreed on at the session of 22 June by the approval of Cyril's letter and the condemnation of Nestorius' letter and Nestorian excerpts. Many in the audience were probably familiar with theological challenges and perhaps aware of civilian and juridical issues pending for the Cyrillian bishops.[363] Theodotus' homilies do not include clear evidence of dialogue with the audience or their reaction.[364]

The mood and thoughts of the audience could perhaps be sketched from the timing of the conciliar homilies. However, dates and locations specified in the sources are often vague or seem conflicting, and scholars' suggested solutions disagree much. When dates coincide and locations differ, sources are not precise enough to infer if liturgies happened simultaneously in two venues or at different times, in which case the audience could have heard all sermons.

The celebratory mood concerning Nestorius' deposition[365] suggests dating Theodotus' Homily III relatively close to the session of 22 June. Usually it is therefore dated to Sunday 28 June. However, in the *Qērellos* collection, Theodotus' Homily III and Cyril's first homily are dated to Thursday July 2 (Hamlē 8). According to both indications, the homily postdates the arrival of John of Antioch on 26 or 27 June. John's attempt to prevent Cyril and Memnon from celebrating the liturgy on Sunday 28 June failed.[366] It is noteworthy that the Ethiopic source apparently had no problem with dating a sermon to a weekday.[367] Therefore, these celebratory homilies may have even been delivered just after the 22 June session, for example on the Tuesday or Wednesday. In Theodotus' Homily III, as well as in Rheginus' sermon, there is no reference to a challenge to the Cyrillian Council, such as was posed by the Oriental Council. The texts do not seem to prepare the audience for a confrontation with an organised and well supported opposition, and thus do not indicate if the audience was aware of the Antiochene meeting. Rather, both Theodotus and Rheginus reassure the audience of the propriety of their synodical decision, suggesting that the Cyrillians were still in need of encouragement concerning their own deeds.

Theodotus' Homily VI is not clearly dated either. The indication 'on the same day' lacks, in the *Qērellos* collections, a precise reference, tentatively seen as Cyril's second conciliar homily.[368] The importance of the exegesis of

[363] P. 49, 81. See also E. Schwartz, 'Cyrill und der Mönch Viktor' (1926), 12-4.

[364] The rhetorical introduction to Rheginus' sermon mentions some interaction with the audience. ACO I 1/2, 70, 21-3. See pp. 76f.

[365] 'the grace of the Spirit [...] has severed the member', 'to sever the evil [...] is not cruelty', 'how would one remedy one of those so disposed[?]' (ACO I 1/2, 71-2).

[366] ACO I 4, 43-4.

[367] Perhaps, the editors of the *Qērellos* collection were unsure about the correlation of the calendars.

[368] ACO I 1/2, 92-4. See B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 40, 122, 2.

Matthew 16[369] may suggest a dating related to the arrival of the papal legates and the second Cyrillian session,[370] although the Roman see is not mentioned explicitly and Theodotus uses the passage to reinforce the authority and validity of decisions taken by bishops of the church in general.

Homily VI has strong words of encouragement for the bishops to stay united,[371] to be convinced of the uprightness and strength of their decision,[372] and suggests they were by then aware of the existence of concrete and substantial organised opposition.[373] The emphasis on unity may even be a reaction to imperial orders to disband while the leader(s) were under house-arrest.[374] The unnamed reference to Nestorius by 'renegade'[375] may suggest that the sermon precedes the imperial acceptance of Nestorius' voluntary relinquishing of the Constantinopolitan see. Theodotus may have considered the possibility of having some audience for whom Nestorius was still bishop, against whom named diatribe was not fitting.

Venue

This section discusses in more detail the relation between the rubrics and the content of Theodotus' conciliar homilies. It shows that although the collector's note may present true information from a source independent of the main body of the text, the plausible information about day, space and setting may also have been derived solely from the text or have been editorial additions to specify the conciliar setting and thus justify the inclusion in the collections.

Homily III has the more intricate interrelation of rubric and content. It suggests that the circumstantial details need not go back to early tradition, but may have been inferred from the text of the homily by the compilers.

Nestorius is not named in Homily III, however the rubric describes it as 'against Nestorius' (πρὸς Νεστόριον).[376] The theology of one particular individual which Theodotus criticises corresponds to a caricature of Nestorian views, such as presented to the Cyrillians on 22 June in the *florilegium*.[377] His defence of the exclusion from the church of one ill-disposed member agrees

[369] B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 126-8.

[370] See p. 46 and B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 37.

[371] 'no one wavered', 'the strength of the church and its faith', 'you are built and are unshakeable', 'strengthen your minds', B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 124, 16, 124, 2, *ibid.*, 5-6, 132, 2.

[372] 'Fight [...] for the sake of justice', B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 132, 3.

[373] 'Arrows were released', 'the billows of the error *will* not shake our building', B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 124, 16, 130, 5-6.

[374] See p. 81.

[375] B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 124, 5, 128, 16.

[376] ACO I 1/2, 71, 21.

[377] ACO I 1/2, 72, 5ff. and ACO I 1/2, 45ff.

with Nestorius' deposition on 22 June.[378] The author of the rubric relied on the direct addresses against a proponent of Nestorius' Christology[379] to describe the homily as said 'against Nestorius'. He may have inferred from these second person singular addresses that Nestorius was among Theodotus' audience, which the preposition (πρός) can mean. This was impossible, since the Cyrillians were not in communion with Nestorius, who remained anyway in voluntary isolation. Therefore, the second person singular 'dialogues' are only oratorical tools to admonish more persuasively those who might waver in the defence of the Cyrillian exclusion of Nestorius from communion. The addressee in the direct discourse evolves from an absent enemy of the faith – indeed, condemned *in absentia* – to those actually present and listening. Nestorius may be understood as the referential for all the 'you' being addressed (albeit not named),[380] but the same admonitions apply to Nestorians who ought to recant, and to 'orthodox' bishops who ought to be sure and clear about their allegiance, even if they had already condemned Nestorius and his views.

The Ethiopic *Qērellos* collection and the 15CE manuscript of the *Collectio Seguierana*[381] attest a manuscript tradition which interprets ἐν Ἰωάννῃ τῶι εὐαγγελιστῆι as a time reference to a feast day of John the Evangelist. All other manuscripts[382] do not supply ἡμέραι. Also the rubric of one of Cyril's homilies has this reference to John the Evangelist,[383] and this main witness to the *Coll. Vat.* attests the longer version which refers to the feast day, while the early Latin translation has the clarification 'Eiusdem dicta in Iohannis euangelistae basilica'.[384] The critical edition[385] adopts in both cases the reading which suggests that it refers to the location. Not only text critical grounds make it impossible to read the dative expression as a reference to a day in the rubric of Theodotus' homily. The only attested feast for John the Evangelist during summer and autumn, after 22 June, would fall as late as 26 September.[386] Unfortunately, the one manuscript tradition with the interpolation guided not only the Ethiopic translation but also early printed editions, whose translations and interpretations the *Patrologia Graeca* incorporated, assuring a significant impact in the literature.[387]

[378] ACO I 1/2, 71, 25ff. and ACO I 1/2, 54, 27.
[379] ACO I 1/2, 72, 33ff.
[380] ACO I 1/2, 72, 7ff.
[381] Ms. D. (ACO I 1/2, 71 *app. ad. loc.*).
[382] Mss. VMPSW (ACO I 1/2, 71 *app. ad. loc.*).
[383] ACO I 1/2, 94, 23.
[384] *Cf.* ACO I 4, 63 footnote 2.
[385] E. Schwartz, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum* (1914ff.).
[386] PG77, 4385. The sources suggest the delegation remained in Chalcedon or Constantinople between the meetings with the emperor early in September, and the consecration of Maximian, at the end of October.
[387] For example, G.L. Castro, *Teodoto di Ancira* (1992), 101.

The information in the rubric may, however, stem from the text, where Theodotus praises John the Evangelist, and 'this metropolis'.[388] This doubtlessly confirms that Theodotus preached the sermon in Ephesus. Should there have been no information on the location, the mention of John the Evangelist may have led a later editor to infer it was delivered in the church dedicated to this saint, possibly echoing similar references[389] already available. Theodotus, however, is not explicit about the venue, wherefore caution is needed to use this rubric as proof-text that the bishops of the Cyrillian Council at least during their liturgical celebrations used the most important church of Ephesus for their liturgies, or that Theodotus preached there.

The veracity of the rubrics concerning the conciliar roles of Homilies I[390] and II[391] is more difficult to judge. Their narrative details have no echoes in the sermons. Two caveats, at least, are clear. The rubrics may have been added to justify the inclusion of a text which the compilers wanted or needed to incorporate. They may also have drawn on an early manuscript tradition closely linked to Theodotus, where this information was added to the homilies to confer greater importance, or could have been derived and corroborated from Theodotus' participation at the session.

Some characteristics of Theodotus' homiletics

The few surviving texts by Theodotus were enough for one scholar to describe his homiletics as talented ('begabt'), highlighting his use of short sentences, incisive phrasing and engaging vocabulary to address the hearer and to acquaint him with the situation by means of rhetorical questions.[392]

The overall clarity of Theodotus' style stems from a simple syntax and a composition which is driven forward by known formulae, rhetorical images, questions and repetitions,[393] as well as being organised around scriptural quotations. Theodotus' texts exemplify how effective communication could be achieved

[388] ACO I 1/2, 73, 19-22.

[389] Like ACO I 1/2, 94, 23.

[390] 'By the same, said on the day of the nativity of our saviour Jesus Christ, and itself read aloud in the same synod.' ACO I 1/2, 80, 30-1.

[391] '(Homily) by Theodotus, bishop of Ancyra, on the nativity of the saviour, read at the council in the presence of the Bishop Cyril', ACO I 1/2, 73, 26-7.

[392] B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 36-7, who also praises the *Exp. symb.* and uses Theodotus as a paradigm with which to compare other conciliar preachers. For example, he, as well as O. Shchuryk, 'The Christological Position of Acacius' (2010), characterises Acacius' literary style as more complicated than that of Theodotus et al., pointing out the use of longer sentences, unclear comparisons, and the dogmatic orientation of the content. See also G.L. Castro, *Teodoto di Ancira* (1992), 35, *id.*, 'Osservazioni su un'omelia greca sul battesimo' (1992), 309.

[393] See A. Weckwerth, *Ablauf, Organisation und Selbstverständnis westlicher antiker Synoden* (2007), 26 for juridical and conciliar parallels of piling up of meanings meant to increase the precision.

by delivering a homily with a clear structure and employing to a large extent topics and vocabulary which were common, so as to establish a link with the audience by shared concepts.[394]

The coherence of the conciliar homilies is exemplified by bringing back into focus at the end of the work major themes mentioned at the beginning, οἰκονομία in Homily III and the 'fight for the faith' in Homily VI. Theodotus binds contrasting thematic blocks by a few sentences. Besides the cohesion of the text on a structural level,[395] grounded on common rhetorical assumptions, Theodotus built on ideas shared by the audience.

Homilies III and VI have characteristics of all major genres of classical rhetoric.[396] The epideictic style is represented in the extensive praise of Cyril, as well as in the derision of Nestorius, or more accurately, of the unnamed enemy. Ultimately, however, simple praise is not the main message Theodotus tries to convey. The Cyrillian bishops ought to have been acquainted with the theological material of the statements and documents read at their conciliar session(s), and Theodotus' Christological topics and arguments[397] largely echo them. He draws no attention to differing views or potential dissension among the Cyrillians. In so far as the transmission of content is not the main focus of the conciliar homilies, they also fail to be didactic texts. It is, however, unclear how steadfast and committed the Cyrillians were. Defending the uprightness of the conciliar doctrine and proceeding,[398] Theodotus encourages and admonishes the bishops of the council,[399] and even more so a later reader of the text within the collections of conciliar documents. Perhaps, the conciliar homilies ought to be primarily placed in the deliberative genre. Theodotus exhorts all bishops to defend orthodox Christology; Cyril's teaching had been endorsed on 22 June, and thus Cyril provided Theodotus with a clear anchoring reference. Cyril is the 'rock [who] the mystery of the incarnation, truly, recognised'.[400] Praise that refers back to Cyril occurs throughout Homily VI. Theodotus sees in Cyril's Christology his biggest contribution and achievement, and describes some of

[394] The rhetorical merits prompted F.E. Sciuto, 'Una citazione virgiliana in Teodoto' (1991), 524, to guess that Theodotus was a school master. As a counter-argument, suppose there was no biographical information about Gregory Nazianzen; applying the same argument to his opus, not least his poetic and apologetic works, would absurdly suggest he was an excellent school-master, surpassing in the fourth-century even Libanius.

[395] Lack thereof in most fifth-century homiletics is used in A. Merkt, 'Mündlichkeit: Ein Problem der Hermeneutik' (1997) as proof of the improvisation and scarcity of reworking of patristic homilies. The author points to several examples which minimise the coherence of the text, and the control an author had over the version being written down and circulated.

[396] Compare with K.-H. Uthemann, 'Forms of communication in the homilies of Severian of Gabala' (1998), 139.

[397] ACO I 1/2, 72, 9ff., B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 128, 3ff.

[398] ACO I 1/2, 71, 25ff., B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 126, 1-6.

[399] ACO I 1/2, 72, 3ff., B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 132.

[400] B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 128, 19.

its key elements. Theodotus' theology and that of all Cyrillian bishops is supposed to be the same as Cyril's.

Theodotus' conciliar homilies have many marks of orality, however, even the most explicit instances may not indicate real exchange of ideas between preacher and audience, rather be only part of oral rhetoric.[401] This is perhaps best exemplified in the extensive addresses in the second person singular and direct questions to the listener,[402] who instantiates the saved humanity, to make Christological orthodoxy more relevant. Theodotus interweaves an occasional use of the first person plural, placing himself among the audience, and alongside it within humanity.[403] Passages[404] which might suggest many were distracted or facing difficulties to hear,[405] are rather intrinsic to the structure of the text, articulating the development of thought.

Theodotus uses scripture in line with the practice of fourth and fifth-century homiletics in general, albeit arguably less abundantly than Cyril and Proclus.[406] In the conciliar homilies, Theodotus' quotations are mainly restricted to scriptural passages central to ecclesiology and the Christological debate. Sometimes Theodotus identifies the scriptural source, especially when he quotes it at length or discusses it more,[407] but he also can quote a passage verbatim without giving the reference.[408] Furthermore, his text draws on scripture for examples, arguments, images, *etc.* without citing a passage. Theodotus builds expansively around citations from scriptures. Even when he claims to be citing it, Theodotus' quotation can be quite free. For example, Theodotus' exegesis of *Phil.* 2:5 makes it necessary to translate the quotation[409] differently from most 'biblical versions', with loss of all moral meaning it might have. That is, the clause 'ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ' is best rendered literally, as 'this which was also in Christ Jesus', and not with the meaning of 'life in Christ',[410] 'Christ's attitude', for example.[411]

[401] See p. 40, C. Ronning, 'Rituale der Rhetorik – Rhetorik der Rituale' (2003), 133-4. Especially conciliar homilies are likely to have been edited carefully when they were included in the collections.

[402] *E.g.* B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 128, 2-5. ACO I 1/2, 72, 14-5.

[403] ACO I 1/2, 72, 16-9. B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 130, 8-9.

[404] *E.g.* B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 124, 15, where 'joy' is actually part of a circular composition.

[405] J.LR. Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication* (2006), 94, N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 158.

[406] See note 6 in R. Caro, *La homilética mariana griega* (1972), 161.

[407] Mention of Jeremiah and of 'the great apostle' in Homily III, ACO I 1/2, 71, 32 and 72, 31.

[408] *Luke* 1:31 in ACO I 1/2, 72, 33.

[409] ACO I 1/2, 72, 31.

[410] Einheitsübersetzung.

[411] The Common English Bible.

Theodotus quotes only scripture as authoritative text, but he expresses many theological ideas in ways which echo credal formulae.[412] Statements of faith were often presented to showcase orthodoxy, in line with their centrality for the apprehension of Christianity in churches,[413] and the Nicene creed played a central role in the decision-making process of councils.[414] Despite this importance, verses from creeds were rarely quoted verbatim in homilies. More frequent are credal echoes, which in Theodotus serve the following twofold function, one linked to orality, the other to persuasion.

From the point of view of oral delivery, it is often argued that formulaic passages give the speaker time to gather his thoughts while speaking.[415] In a sermon, which is not a text read aloud but always improvised to a certain extant,[416] the use of such formulae or block statements can then indicate the author falling back to expressions which he could speak out while thinking about what to say next. However, Theodotus' expansion of ideas by rephrasing them in similar ways does not introduce redundancy. It emphasises the topic for the benefit of the audience, and is structured as gradations where the least element is by itself relevant.[417]

The choice of credal material was not random, since it also had important, characteristically Christian, argumentative and persuasive roles. Passages which resemble credal statements, kerygmatic or doxological formulations reflect an ongoing pattern of realisation of synods and presentation of their outcome in terms of restatements of a standard creed (such as the Nicene creed), with the addition of a few refining *clausulae*.[418] Indeed, the recurrence of sentences which in sound and structure tend to resemble doxological formulations exemplifies how much credal texts were part of the liturgical reality of the Greek bishops, even if creeds were not yet regularly part of the liturgy.[419] Creeds could be used as decisive arguments in view of their central place in theology.[420]

[412] ACO I 1/2, 73, 12-9, B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 130, 7-11. See À. Weckwerth, *Ablauf, Organisation und Selbstverständnis westlicher antiker Synoden* (2007), 26.

[413] J.A. McGuckin, 'Mystery or conundrum?' (2008), 251.

[414] See the section on p. 54, and W. Kinzig *et al.*, *Tauffragen und Bekenntnis* (1999), 217ff.

[415] Similar ideas come up in most discussions involving orality, from Homeric poetry to musicology, ventured as motivations or explanations for epithets, melismata, *etc.*

[416] See M.J. Carruthers, *The Craft of Thought* (1998) for a discussion of what memorisation and repetition meant in the Middle Ages, that it was not a servile rerendering, identical in all details.

[417] See A. Merkt, 'Mündlichkeit: Ein Problem der Hermeneutik' (1997), 80 for a different conclusion based on the analysis of sermons by Maximus of Turin.

[418] J.A. McGuckin, 'Mystery or conundrum?' (2008), 251, 255ff.

[419] Regular insertion of creeds into eucharistic and baptismal liturgies is associated with Justinian, see *ibid.*, 251, W. Kinzig *et al.*, *Tauffragen und Bekenntnis* (1999), 240, L.H. Westra, *The Apostles' Creed* (2002), 17ff.

[420] See the section on p. 193 for the centrality of the salvation of human beings in Theodotus' approach to Christology. For this, the passage 'for us men and for our salvation' in the Nicene

Thus, what sounds like dogmatic statements, in short sentences, incisive phrasing and seemingly accurate vocabulary is not only a stylistic feature of Theodotus' homiletics,[421] but part of the content. Also his briefness seems deliberate, as there is no sign that Theodotus was interrupted. A disruptive intrusion was not to be expected in a partisan, well-educated audience which was presented with a brief sermon which was largely non-polemical for the Cyrillian bishops. Therefore, Theodotus probably developed his topics as much as he saw appropriate for the occasion.

The following sections address a few elements of classical rhetoric present in Theodotus' homilies which have an important argumentative role in the conciliar setting. Nevertheless, it ought to be remarked that Theodotus also employed several rhetorical operations,[422] and quoted Virgil at one point.[423]

Fictional dialogues

Fictional dialogues are probably the most noticeable rhetorical device among the several figures of speech which recur in Theodotus' homilies. Almost all works attributed to him contain theatrical-like paraphrases of scriptural passages, usually in the form of fictional dialogues, whether between the preacher and his audience, or, more importantly, as dialogues put into the mouth of the biblical characters,[424] changing the words without making the reference unrecognisable. Even if the engagement is with an absent interlocutor, the passages may be considered marks of orality. Voice was often given to characters also in texts composed as written works.

Extensive elaboration on a biblical citation is often used as strong evidence that the passage was read during the same liturgical celebration.[425] This assumes accurate knowledge of scriptures by heart was uncommon, and especially for conciliar homilies, does not take into account that many of the elaborated passages were at the centre of the disagreements. Knowledge in an oral society (even if widely literate) accommodated variants,[426] creating a nebulous realm

creed is in the background as much as passages from scripture, as discussed in H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 504.

[421] See p. 98.

[422] In Homily III.3, ACO I 1/2, 72, 16ff. it is easy to list examples of assonance, alliteration, anaphora, internal rhyme and poliptoton, epistrophe and antistrophe, isocolon, apostrophe (and aposiopesis). Compare J.H. Barkhuizen, *Proclus, Bishop of Constantinople – Homilies on the Life of Christ* (2001), 13-22.

[423] M. Jugie (ed.), *Homélies mariales* (1926), 334, 33-9. On the citation of a Greek version of the (in)famous passage from Eclogue 4, see F.E. Sciuto, 'Una citazione virgiliana in Teodoto' (1991).

[424] That is, *sermocinatio*. See H.M. Meissner, 'Grammatik und Rhetorik' (1993) for examples prior to Theodotus. See also J. Kecskeméti, 'Deux caractéristiques de la prédication' (1996).

[425] For example, M. Fassler, 'The first Marian feast' (2001), 44.

[426] See M.J. Carruthers, *The Craft of Thought* (1998).

of what would be seen as the standard text or not. Theodotus' biblical fictions fall into this scope of recognisable imprecision. He departed and returned to scripture, weaving his exegesis into it. Seamlessly intercalating into the quotation a fictional dialogue displayed his rhetorical prowess. Theodotus' aim was not to make a bishop in the audience question his own memory of the exact wording of scripture, but to express his ideas in a way so consonant with scripture that it would not be deemed extraneous to it, or new. As much as 'scriptural fiction' attests to Theodotus' artistry,[427] its use in polemic homilies to transform the biblical passage or at least re-contextualise it[428] points to a persuasive intention with some measure of misrepresentation, perchance deceit. A modern reader may be concerned when the audience would become aware that they were being presented not with a scriptural passage, but with an inventive variant or expansion. Without a well settled standard text of scripture widely available, a preacher could try to make his audience accept some assertions as being scriptural, which would confer them the greatest authority. Theodotus, however, does not seem to have attempted this.

As an example of fictional dialogue, in Homily VI.4, the exegesis of *Matt.* 16:13-20 is structured as a conversation between Jesus and Peter. Gradually the imagined discourse put into the mouth of Christ extends the biblical passage, and it ends again consonant with the passage from scripture. It is conducive to the verisimilitude and the effectiveness of the piece that Jesus utters the Christological interpretation of Peter's answer.[429] Prior to Christ's death and Pentecost it was not plausible that any human except Christ could have the sort of insight that goes beyond what was visible in Christ – despite the miracles he had performed.[430] Such questions of who could say what would take exegetes like Gregory of Nyssa to consider that passages of the Old Testament were actually said by Christ.[431] Ultimately, this derived from the classical idea that the trustworthiness of the speaker contributed to the acceptance of his speech. It was under the general heading of prosopopoeia that it was discussed whether a speech was befitting to a person.[432] Fictional dialogue as a figure of

[427] G.L. Castro, *Teodoto di Ancira* (1992), 6.

[428] As in Homily VI.4 – B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 126-8 –, and I.3 – ACO I 1/2, 82, 13.

[429] '[Y]ou called me, the visible one, "God λόγος", and the mystery of the incarnation, truly, you recognised, and what is in the form of a servant, lord you called.' B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 128, 18ff.

[430] *E.g.* wonders in *Matthew* 9, and references to recognition of Christ in *Matt.* 9:5-6.

[431] See, for example, Gr. Nyss., *Hom. 2 in Eccl.*, F. Müller (ed.), *Gregorii Nysseni Opera* (1958) V, 298, 5 - 299, 10, S.G. Hall (ed.), *Gregory of Nyssa, Homilies on Ecclesiastes* (1992), 48-9.

[432] See especially C. Schäublin, *Untersuchungen zu Methode und Herkunft der antiochenischen Exegese* (1974), 34ff., B. Neuschäfer, *Origenes als Philologe* (1987), 35ff., H.M. Meissner, 'Grammatik und Rhetorik' (1993), 235: 'Auch in den Iliasscholien finden wir die Bemerkung, daß eine Rede aufgrund der Besonderheit der Person, die sie vorträgt, besonders glaubwürdig (ἀξιόπιστος) ist. Den Gedanken, daß die Person des Sprechers selbst zur Glaubwürdigkeit einer

thought fits into the description of προθεωρία.[433] Theodotus' aim was to convey a deeper meaning of the passage, under the guise of preserving it.

Theodotus' free paraphrases are rarely preceded by a literal rendering of the scriptural passage,[434] and yet it is usually recognisable from the start. Parts of the citation are intercalated in the paraphrase and in the final expanded version. Thus, the text has a directionality, and the scriptural excerpt is aimed for. Theodotus' paraphrases are always expansions of scripture, with which to convey a more specific reading,[435] or place it in what seems another context.[436]

Heretical genealogies

Although not strictly a figure of speech or thought, Theodotus' use of heretical genealogies also merits attention among the stylistic features that depend of the values of classical rhetoric. Claims of support from authoritative teaching and accusations via links to reprehensible or condemned examples of the past were a common feature of ancient literature and part of the late antique rhetorical training, *e.g.* in the composition of praises and defamations. The interrelationships between systems of philosophical thought was phrased in terms of relations between persons rather than abstract ideas.[437]

During the Council of Ephesus, affiliation to a patristic genealogy was explored manifoldly to strengthen an assertion.[438] The other side of this approach to the past and to inherited teachings was the attack of opponents by drawing links to views held by individuals seen as heretics or negative examples. The study of heresiologies[439] shows that just as there was a search for a line of succession through teaching deriving from a figure of great authority with which to validate orthodoxy,[440] in both sacramental and disciplinal questions, so the authors also tried to undermine their opponents and enemies by placing them in a line of succession with the great heresies of the past. They tried to link them, at least verbally, to heretics, Jews and pagans. It was a suitable

Rede beiträgt, führt Aristoteles unter den Überzeugungsmitteln auf. [*e.g. Rhet.* I, 2 1356a1-13; *cf.* I, 11 1371a8-17]'.

[433] *Ibid.*, 242, 244.

[434] M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 224, 9-11.

[435] B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 128.

[436] ACO I 1/2, 82, 20-6.

[437] See A. Brent, 'Diogenes Laertius and the apostolic succession' (1993), 372.

[438] See the section on p. 56.

[439] Recent publications include P. Allen, *Sophronius of Jerusalem* (2009) and R. Flower, 'Genealogies of unbelief' (2011).

[440] Encompassing anointing, adoption (spiritual and/or familiar), appointment, *etc.* A good example is the claim for a line of apostolic succession of some episcopal sees, like Rome. Especially in Homily VI, Theodotus emphasised that all bishops should have a certain direct link to the apostles.

tactic especially when one could point to actual similarities to certain heresies. Increasingly there were ready made lists of heretical successions, at the end of which to stick the opponent.[441] Even if many heresies being alluded to were unrelated to the doctrinal dispute in question, it was still weighty to attack by references to Arians, Sabellians, *etc.* Although the roots of heresiology can be traced back biblically to the Old Testament, and, in Greek rhetoric, to the fourth century BC,[442] it was during the fourth century, in the aftermath of Nicaea, that it gained momentum.

Heresiologies served a significant hermeneutic-sociological role, and in general were employed meaningfully. Although there was not always a one-to-one correspondence, the ideas under attack were usually related to the chosen heresy.[443] The passages which dealt with the 'old' heresies did not address much, if at all, the historical causes of their outbreaks. The rise of 'new' errors was expounded as stemming from previous ideas. The explanations were, so to speak, 'inherited' from the tradition, and most can be traced back to earlier diatribes and apologies.[444] Passages concerning heresies frequently contained quite aggressive content, with which modern readers struggle, while scholars see in them evidence for social tensions in late antiquity.[445]

Heretical genealogies occur under a few guises in Theodotus' homilies. Usually a heresy is alluded to by some stereotypes linked to it, and rarely is a heretic named. Sometimes the reference is imprecise, and only hints that those in error were a large group which lacked faith and remained outside the church.

Theodotus named no heretic but Photinus.[446] Photinus was condemned at the Synod of Sirmium in 351.[447] By the time of Theodotus, Photinus' views had been 'reduced and simplified to a few choice slogans that were easily read as a position completely decontextualized from the church's tradition and scripture'.[448] The church moved against Photinus as in the case of Arius: the linkage with

[441] A. Cameron, 'How to read heresiology' (2003), 475-6, 478.

[442] Once Christian homiletics has literary pretensions, it abides by the principle that in elevated rhetorical genres, living people being criticised are not named. See E. Schwartz, *Zwei Predigten Hippolyts* (1936).

[443] See R. Lyman, 'A topography of heresy' (1993), 47-8, and, in the context of Ps. Athanasius *Contra Arianos* IV, M. Vinzent, *Pseudo-Athanasius, Contra Arianos IV* (1996), 129.

[444] For a study of these aspects in Cyril's anti-Nestorian works, see M.-O. Boulnois, 'The mystery of the Trinity according to Cyril of Alexandria' (2003), 82-3.

[445] D. Mendels, 'The relationship of Christians and Jews' (2002), K.-H. Uthemann, 'Die Sprachtheorie des Eunomios von Kyzikos' (1993).

[446] In Homily II, ACO I 1/2, 75, 9. See also R. Caro, *La homilética mariana griega* (1972), 161.

[447] In 351, the synodical bishops were in part trying to move away from the failure of Serdica. There was also a real concern about a view which could, for example, be used to make evident the extremes of μία ὑπόστασις Trinitarian approaches. Actually, this only becomes apparent in detailed analyses of the reports about Photinus' theology, *cf.* D.H. Williams, Monarchianism and Photinus of Sirmium (2006), 200.

[448] *Ibid.*, 205.

heretical characters meant that any extended refutation of his theology – where it was actually known – was redundant to what supposedly everyone already knew, a minor but chronic irritation in the search for the Christian doctrine of God. By the time of the struggle against Nestorius, some bishops would rather preach against this search, since the whole spectrum of Christological interpretation[449] lay just beneath the surface of Nicene theology and Trinitarian 'orthodoxy'.

Another explicit attack in Theodotus' homilies is against Hellenism. In Theodotus' homilies there are interjections against 'the Greeks'.[450] It occurs in Homily I, and is developed in greater length in Homily V.[451] Hellenism, however, was not only used as a label with which to offend the opposing party. The charge of Hellenism was largely brought up to accuse of not 'simply believing', and to represent negatively attempts to understand the 'being' of God.[452]

The use of attacks against paganism as part of the ongoing campaign to spread Christianity and as part of rivalries between Christian groups often seems to be taken as mutually excluding.[453] Rather, while the long standing campaign against paganism provided arguments and slogans against heretics, the fact that in the view of many preachers, not least of Theodotus, heresies arose from Christians pursuing things which were being blamed as typical of paganism, only made it more pertinent to mention attacks against pagan traits in sermons directed at Christians. The pursuit of philosophy and other intellectual endeavours, where reasoning was applied to matters of faith, was both seen as typical of paganism and as a possible cause of heresy.[454]

[449] See L.R. Wickham, 'Review of *The Dyophysite Christology*' (2010), as quoted on p. 172.

[450] The identification of paganism with Greek culture may also be related to social problems where the local population had some resentment against a Greek elite which often kept the observance of the pagan rites. It is not clear if the situation described in Egypt in E. Wipszycka, *Études sur le christianisme dans l'Égypte* (1996), 86, can be applied to Theodotus' Galatia.

[451] Homily I: ACO I 1/2, 82, 11ff., Homily V: M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 227, 13ff.

[452] Some of the best descriptions of this trend are found in studies of the generation after Theodotus'. See K.-H. Uthemann, 'Die Sprachtheorie des Eunomios von Kyzikos' (1993), 337. Theodotus is one of the first examples of this apologetic perspective, which then gains importance *e.g.* in the Theosophy (by anonymous monophysites), see P.F. Beatrice, *Anonymi Monophysitae theosophia* (2001), xxii.

[453] For example, considering Cyril, whose career, especially if analysed from the point of view of the festal letters, is often schematised as having an initial phase when, trying to secure his position, he dealt mostly with the opposition to paganism, until he concentrated his efforts against Nestorius: 'An die Stelle des philosophisch argumentierenden Apologeten und philosophisch-theologischen Katecheten tritt immer stärker der bischöfliche Seelsorger und theologische Häretikerbekämpfer.' in M. Vinzent, 'Vom philosophischen Apologeten zum theologischen Ketzerbekämpfer' (2003), 177. Seen thus, all and any reference to aspects of Hellenism would from some point on be only items of 'Lasterkataloge'.

[454] See pp. 181ff.

Jews form another group who bore the burden of Theodotus' invective as a mean of indirect attack.[455] If the 'Greeks' stand for those who have been voluntarily erring away from the faith or the truth which has been accessible to them, the 'Jew' is the antagonist Theodotus favours in fictional dialogues when he tries to reason with the interlocutor, which does not happen in the anti-Hellenic passages.[456] In this way, Theodotus differs slightly[457] from the gradation which can be read into the distinction of Greeks and Jews, attested already in Clement and Origen, where the Greeks stand for the gentiles open to conversion, to become part of the all embracing church, as opposed to the 'post-Resurrection Jews', who instead resent and are jealous of the gentiles. Theodotus' and the traditional perspective coincide when the opponents are broadly named as Jews having in mind such passages of the New Testament which point to their inability to see, at least to see that which goes beyond the obvious, and the sense-perceptible – according to the flesh (κατὰ σῶμα).[458] It is a typical example of Theodotus' approach to heresiology, where he derives the vein of accusation pursued in slogans and interjections from the content of the passage of scripture under analysis.[459]

To sum up, the predominance of Photinus, Hellenism and antijudaism in Theodotus' heresiology is indicative of his close links to the fourth-century Trinitarian debate.[460]

[455] See also M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 244-5, S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004), 191ff. Antijudaism is widespread in patristic homiletics, and sometimes it reflects tensions in the co-existence of Jews and Christians in various regions. See M.B. Cunningham, 'Polemic and exegesis' (1999), 46 and D. Mendels, 'The relationship of Christians and Jews' (2002). Since Jews are mentioned – and attacked – in scripture and are older than all heresies, their name could be used when addressing any opponent. In the rhetoric of patristic texts they are often seen in the same light as the heretics: they do not acknowledge the same faith; they have heard about the true faith, but have not embraced it. Specific to their situation is that they already share, in part, the 'right' beliefs, but fail to ever have had the correct faith in its entirety (a Christian heretic, instead, is seen as someone who deviates from the correct faith).

[456] ACO I 1/2, 74.

[457] For example, Homily IV.6 (PG77, 1397A), Theodotus actually does not regard the 'Jew' any higher than the 'Greeks'.

[458] ACO I 1/2, 82, 12ff. Other senses of σῶμα, such as those referring to *Rom.* 8:8, are alluded to in Theodotus' reproach, in view of earlier Jewish 'shortcomings', attested in passages of the Old Testament. Furthermore, an array of deeper misconceptions (*Romans* 11) implied that they were not likely to convert, and therefore could not be redeemed. Addressing error, conversion and redemption, Theodotus used these passages, and the remarks against 'Jew' inherit their sense. See also S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004), 216-7.

[459] *Cf.* W. Kinzig and C. Kück (eds), *Judentum und Christentum* (2002). Compare to Proclus' use of Jew as an aggressive term for anything that is not an orthodox Christian: N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 155, 276-7.

[460] See R.M. Hübner, *Die Schrift des Apolinarius* (1989), 126-30.

Background and context of the homilies read at the council

Considering the information in the rubrics,[461] Homilies I and II seem to have originally been delivered prior to the council, probably in Ancyra, and then read in Ephesus. Earlier scholarship has always discussed them alongside some or all the other homilies attributed to Theodotus as examples of festal homilies with Marian content.[462] The transmission of the other festal homilies by Theodotus is not related to the reasonably reliable, albeit challengingly complex, line of transmission associated to the collections of conciliar documents. For example, Codex Parisinus 1171, a typical collection of homilies organised by feast days,[463] contains four homilies ascribed to Theodotus and raises authenticity and textual issues.[464] The critical edition of Homilies I and II took into account only conciliar documentation, although Homily II, for example, figures in *Scorial* 538, a collection of festal homilies.[465] The transmission of Homily V in only one manuscript exemplifies the hazards and uncertainties of the preservation of late antique texts. Furthermore, during the compilation and copying of collections, patristic homilies were vulnerable to attribution to more famous or more saintly authors, fragmentation and reorganisation of the text. For example, at one point Homily II was also attributed to Cyril of Alexandria.[466]

In the remainder of this section a chronology of Theodotus' homilies is ventured after a few remarks on the current text of Homilies I and II, considering

[461] See p. 77.

[462] The partial discussion of Homilies I, II and IV in R. Caro, *La homilética mariana griega* (1972), which paved the way for their use in scholarship dedicated to homiletics and Marian studies, is accompanied by a detailed paraphrase. Homilies I and II are translated in A.J. Festugière, *Ephèse et Chalcédoine: actes* (1982). The detailed analysis of Homily V in M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960) is almost a translation. Homily VII and VIII are seldom attributed to Theodotus. See also M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie grecque inédite' (1969).

[463] M.B. Cunningham, 'Preaching and the community' (1990), 42.

[464] M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 223, discusses the rather poor scribal practice of this manuscript, with many orthographical problems. The main authenticity problems concern Homily IV, since *Paris. gr.* 1171 represents a different recension from *Paris. suppl. gr.* 399 which is the only Greek text available in print, in PG 77. J.P. Migne, *S. Cyrillus Alexandrinus, Theodotus Ancyranus* (1859) also reproduces (on columns 1410-2) the Latin translation of the last paragraph of Homily IV in *Paris. gr.* 1171, absent from *Paris. suppl. gr.* 399. Its Greek text has not yet been published, which is only the most obvious desideratum for a discussion of Theodotus' authorship of the homily. At least five manuscripts contain it, and, furthermore, Nicephorus of Constantinople cited under its incipit in *Antirrhetica* extensive passages which cannot be found in the text in PG 77. See M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie grecque inédite' (1969), 7-9 on some of the textual and theological topics at stake.

[465] This manuscript was not used for the preparation of the critical edition, E. Schwartz, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum* (1914ff.). The volume is a 11CE ms. of John Damascene's *Sacra parallela* (PG95, 1040 - PG96, 544), to which were added paper folios from the 15CE at the beginning. Theodotus' homily is on Folios 1-4, followed by two folios of excerpts from Cyril, himself and Athanasius, see E. Miller, *Catalogue des manuscrits* (1848), 479-80.

[466] M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 221.

whether it represents an 'original' version, or if it was substantially tailored to resemble Theodotus' views at the council.

Written homilies were read for several reasons, for example, to spread the views of a metropolitan,[467] help less gifted preachers,[468] provide evidence of orthodoxy and heresy, inspire theological reflection and discussion. If performed in a liturgical context, a subordinate bishop or a cleric may have read the text, possibly faithful to the letter of what someone higher in the church hierarchy wrote. If a gifted orator such as Theodotus 'read' his prior homily, he was more likely to adapt it, however slightly.[469] The reading of earlier homilies to the bishops gathered at Ephesus could fall into any of these possibilities.

The rubrics of Homilies I and II say they were read to the council, employing the terms ἀναγνωσθεῖσα[470] and ὑπανεγνώσθη.[471] ἀναγνωσθεῖσα is also used in the minutes of 22 June to describe the reading of Cyril's and Nestorius' letters, and, in later meetings, of the proceedings of previous sessions.[472] This instruction adds the possibility that they were read as documents to the bishops gathered for a session, in which case the reading may have been done by a 'professional reader' from a prepared text. Furthermore, against a reading in a liturgical context weights the unsuitableness of a nativity homily to any liturgy in the summer of 431.[473]

Whatever performance the pre-conciliar homilies had in Ephesus, the text included in the conciliar collections probably represents a version where superfluous or questionable passages were edited. Thus, it is likely that the current text is at least twice removed from the original sermon. Since they form the bulk of Theodotus' undisputed works, they represent the benchmark of his theology and it is therefore impossible to judge if they represent Theodotus' pre-conciliar opinion faithfully. Nevertheless, a few aspects suggest that the transmitted text largely resembles Theodotus' sermon. First, expressions which at first seem to indicate the adaptation of language and content to episcopal and courtly audiences, such as 'splendid audience'[474] were also regularly used for audiences across the empire. Secondly, passages where the ideas and expression seem

[467] Typically exemplified by the Egyptian Pascal homilies.

[468] A. Merkt, 'Mündlichkeit: Ein Problem der Hermeneutik' (1997), 78.

[469] See M.J. Carruthers, *The Craft of Thought* (1998), 63.

[470] Homily I, ACO I 1/2, 73, 27.

[471] Homily II, ACO I 1/2, 80, 32.

[472] See, respectively, p. 56, p. 57 and p. 80. *Cf.* T. Graumann, 'Protokollierung, Aktenerstellung' (2010), 29-30.

[473] The text of Homilies I and II contains references to the feast as 'this day' (ACO I 1/2, 73 28; 77, 10) which are at odds with the conciliar period. In this scenario, the available text probably represents the version which the reader had, and not what was heard in Ephesus. The homilies would not have been recorded during delivery.

[474] ACO I 1/2, 73, 28. Compare with Acacius' Homily, B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 68.

more fitting to a provincial than a conciliar or imperial audience, such as the clarification of what a *sacra* is, or the negative views about wealth.

The long excursus about a *sacra* in Homily II,[475] raises, in an initial reading, the issue of knowledge of Latin by the audience which seems more relevant to an audience in Ancyra than in Ephesus.[476] The discussion about 'sacra' would have had in any setting an enlightening dimension for those who did not know Latin or were not acquainted with this aspect of the functioning of the imperial administration. Despite its presence in classical education, fluency in Latin was quite rare, apparently also among the bishops gathered in Ephesus for the council, so that Juvenal, for example, stood out among the fathers for it.[477] Theodotus' excursus about *sacra* does not indicate he could speak Latin, or was directly acquainted with such a sort of document, or with the vocabulary associated therewith.[478] Knowledge of Latin and of technical, mostly legal, vocabulary, has often been used as evidence of a wider role of bishops in late antiquity, involved with its secular aspects.[479] A few Latinisms[480] and Theodotus' participation at conciliar events attended by the papal legates suggest that he knew Latin. The Latinisms may indicate that he was conscious of issues with the precision of translations or equivalent expressions, and of the separate identities of languages. As a digression on language the passage on a *sacra* would be amiss at court, however, as an important Christological argument[481] and an endorsement of imperial authority it had its place in a text for a wider readership, which can explain its appearance in the version in the conciliar collections.

Considerations on Theodotus' preaching in Ancyra

Keeping in mind that the transmitted text may not be a faithful witness of Theodotus' pre-conciliar preaching, rather, was tailored to suit the Nestorian controversy, the next paragraphs discuss the relation with the spread of Nestorian ideas in the first decade of the second quarter of the fifth century.

Homilies I and II suggest that Theodotus had to deal with a deviating belief in his diocese which can be identified with the opinions Nestorius held or was supposed to hold. When Theodotus talked to Nestorius in Ephesus, he could

[475] ACO I 1/2, 79, 31 - 80, 29.

[476] As a linguistic curiosity, the passage can hardly be used as an indication of the level of literacy or of the provinciality of the audience in Ancyra. See also p. 20.

[477] Juvenal not only understood the spoken Latin, but also spoke fluently enough. See E. Honigmann, 'Juvenal of Jerusalem' (1950), 223. See also p. 82.

[478] Especially in an Ancyran context, he could be boasting on what he had just learnt!

[479] Focused in F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), C. Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity* (2005), A. Sterk, *Renouncing the World yet Leading the Church* (2004), C. Humfress, *Orthodoxy and the Courts* (2007).

[480] For example, κώδεσις in Homily IV.3 (PG77, 1393B).

[481] See. p. 165.

see or confirm how many similarities the faith of the Constantinopolitan metropolitan had with errors Theodotus had been warning his audience previously. A conciliar decision against Nestorius would endorse Theodotus' preaching, could help his pastoral work, and was thus worth upholding and defending.

Since discordant views about Christology dominate two homilies delivered on major feasts, they show that the issue had become widespread, and was in need of clarification. Adopting the more straightforward view that Theodotus was in Ancyra on these feast days, and preached the homilies there, they indicate that the Christological debate was not geographically restricted to the centres of the conflicting views, Constantinople, Antioch and Alexandria, but also present in provinces like Galatia. Even in this remoter region it seems to have bothered people of various educational background, since Theodotus probably preached about it to a largely non-specialist congregation of mixed levels of erudition.[482] His approach to the difficult issues at stake insisted on avoiding any discussion of the theological problems themselves, exalting instead theopaschite language and biblical parallels.[483]

With hindsight from the council, Theodotus' arguments were quite at the heart of Cyrillian anti-Nestorian propaganda. However, as stand alone passages, the Christological connection may not have been evident for those who had not set their mind on this debate. Themes like strong opposition to excessive rational reflection on theological problems are exposed at length, but the motivation is elliptically stated as destroying wonders related to changes of nature.[484] Without long digressions on what he was attacking, Theodotus could juxtapose his view of the right faith.[485] However, Theodotus also did not delimit his statements on orthodoxy,[486] and did not have to provide in his homilies a comprehensive and coherent account of it. The audience was meant to recognise passages as being orthodox by their links to scripture[487] and by reference or similarity to central concepts of the Christian faith, for example, part of catechetical and liturgical texts.[488] The structuring of passages by juxtaposition of criticism and references to orthodoxy allowed Theodotus at the same time to exploit apparent shortcomings of the opposition, in so much as they were vulnerable to effective slogans, and to expound his take on orthodoxy to his congregation.

An audience familiar with the arguments and the rhetoric closely connected to the Cyrillian Council would consider much in Theodotus' festal homilies as

[482] *E.g.* ACO I 1/2, 79, 31ff., ACO I 1/2, 86, 17ff.
[483] *E.g.* unquestioning magi in ACO I 1/2, 83, 34.
[484] ACO I 1/2, 84, 16.
[485] ACO I 1/2, 85, 10.
[486] The question ACO I 1/2, 85, 10 is implicitly the correct statement.
[487] ACO I 1/2, 84, 10ff.
[488] *E.g.* allusion to eucharist in ACO I 1/2, 86, 12.

directed specifically against Nestorians. The connection was evident also for Theodotus, who expressed the major topics from Homilies I and II more concisely and related to the Christological conflict in the conciliar homilies III and VI. The criticism of human reason is then clearly associated to introducing divisions in Christ, and the weakness of human nature is used to emphasise Christ's lowering.[489] What applies to the Cyrillian bishops, the Ephesian audience, or the readership of the conciliar collections,[490] need not hold for other regions, even after the council. The Christological debates in Ancyra had perhaps derived from previous local theological conflicts, as in Constantinople, where Nestorius faced an 'arianism-apollianarianism', whose Christology is hardly determinable.[491] Even in Constantinople it is unclear how culturally, socially and geographically widespread the problem was,[492] but a bishop ought to occupy himself with any issue that he thought affected a significant part of the population.

Also in Alexandria, Cyril's early preaching was not dwelling specifically on Christology, but in passing he increased the precision of the concepts and terminology while trying to come to terms with issues arising from the Trinitarian debate.[493] The 'champions' of both sides of the Christological debate claimed, or were said to have dived into the specific Christological problem only as a reaction to antagonist works. Cyril stated he was moved by the unrest caused by Nestorius' works being read by Egyptian monks.[494] When excerpts were used in patristic literature,[495] at best a narrative context was provided, not a

[489] *E.g.* respectively ACO I 1/2, 75, 26ff., 85, 11ff.

[490] Also modern theologians claim that Homily I 'presents a clear ideological and thematic development over Homily II; it reflects fully the context of the Nestorian controversy, especially in its secondary stage, when Nestorius was stating openly the unity of Christ, but insisting subtly in the mental separation of the two natures with their own attributes; at this stage, Theodotus abandons the lines of Antiochene thought, without sundering the old bonds of friendship with Nestorius, to whom he makes reference with temperate and always veiled expressions. This appraisal is corroborated by the argumentation based on Pauline thinking, which Nestorius favours and is completely absent of Homily II, the peculiar conclusion – the plain profession of orthodox faith –, and the parallels with the Homily given at Ephesus.' R. Caro, *La homilética mariana griega* (1972), 167 (my translation). Notice that this train of thought relies on an argument of absence, on claims of parallels with a homily which the author ostensibly refuses to analyse. It assumes that in Ancyra, as in Egypt, Christologically unorthodox ideas had spread because of the circulation of Nestorian writings among the audience. It does not question if the 'profession of faith' and these so called 'parallels' are not due to the transmission of the version recorded in Ephesus.

[491] L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 48-9. *Cf.* S. Wessel, 'Nestorius, Mary and controversy' (1999), 12ff.

[492] L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 62.

[493] J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 30; C.A. Beeley, 'Cyril of Alexandria and Gregory Nazianzen' (2009), 382-3.

[494] *Coll. Vat.* 144, 3-4: ACO I 1/5, 11, 6-29, J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 277; *Coll. Vat.* 1, 5: ACO I 1/1, 12, 21-31, J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 248. Also T.E. Gregory, *Vox Populi* (1979), 88ff.

[495] F.M. Young, *Biblical Exegesis* (1997), 19ff., 40f.

'historical one'. Cyril may have known enough about regional variants of theological vocabulary and the 'Antiochene' approach to appreciate the setting from which Nestorius' works arose, but perhaps deliberately he did not enlighten the monks and others who were reading the homilies of the new metropolitan of Constantinople, and could not be expected to understand the geographical variants.[496] Instruction could have been fitting for this audience, which displayed curiosity beyond diocesan borders. Rather, Cyril challenged Nestorius quite openly, zeal providing a (reasonably) good cover for ambition. His letters and the Alexandrian synods drew attention and also criticism from members of court and church.[497]

The spread of Nestorian ideas prompted no bishop but Cyril to convene a synod to discuss them, suggesting that for them the problem seemed less acute or better to be addressed by other means.[498] Theodotus' preaching, for example, was conveying his view on possibly controversial aspects en passant. The effectiveness of this stance may be gauged comparing to Nestorius' and Cyril's. In Constantinople, Nestorius' pastoral tactics of tackling problems directly were answered with open challenges,[499] while the audience of Theodotus' (and Cyril's) sermons caused them no similar complications, as long as their attacks were not explicit, but Cyril's maneuvering caused him serious worries,[500] and his open criticism escalated the tensions.[501]

The difficulty of understanding and formulating Christology was not new, and the efforts of earlier fathers provided several formulations for fifth-century theologians and preachers from Antioch to Alexandria, over Constantinople and Ancyra.[502] The bishops probably thought they understood the earlier formulations, which by claims to patristic authority could be put to the congregations as background. More likely, the Christological problems and solutions were clear only to the non-average bishop and theologian, the others using it on account of received authority.

If for Homilies I-III and VI authorship and dating relative to the council cause little trouble, the same is not true for the other homilies. Most scholarship which accepts Theodotus' authorship, claims that they were also composed before 431.[503] It has even been suggested that Homily V is to be situated in the

[496] N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 31ff.

[497] J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 47-8.

[498] NB the synod convened in Rome by Celestine responded, like the Council of Ephesus, to mutual complaints by Nestorius and Cyril, and is not an endogenous reaction to the spread of ideas.

[499] See p. 28.

[500] J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 32.

[501] S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004), 77-9, and on the early reaction to the twelve *kephalaia*, A. de Halleux, 'Les douze chapitres cyrilliens au concile' (1992).

[502] L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 57-8.

[503] R. Caro, *La homilética mariana griega* (1972), 173, 181, M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 246.

first quarter of the fifth century.[504] In the following paragraphs it will be argued that both Homilies IV and V are more likely to have been at least partially composed after the summer of 431. Tentatively, also Theodotus' authorship is questioned further, by focusing on the lack of binding elements in Homily IV, which rather seems a juxtaposition of fragments of anti-Nestorian festal homilies,[505] and that Homily V could be a pastiche of theological assertions by Theodotus within an inventive dramatisation of *Matt.* 1:18-25.

The main arguments used to date Homily V some time before the council[506] were a lack of references to the quarrels which caused the gathering of the Council of Ephesus and the Christological vocabulary, which is not as technical as in other of Theodotus' works, such as *Expositio symboli Nicaeni.* However, alongside echoes of Theodoret and a reliance on formulae relatable to Ireneus, also numerous parallels to Cyril's and Proclus' Christological works were identified, which point to a date closer to the council.[507] More importantly, it was not thoroughly appreciated that the comparatively more technical vocabulary is to be expected from the literary genre of a treatise.

A central argument for dating Homilies IV and V before the council is that they seem written as an open reaction to Nestorius. This supposes that Theodotus, being in Ancyra in the years before the council, had to deal there with widespread 'Nestorianism'. It assumes a very quick spread of 'Nestorian' ideas,[508] and their acceptance by part of the population, or a perceived concreteness of the danger of this happening. In Homily IV, the insulting and direct speech to Nestorius,[509] does not suggest Theodotus was preaching in Ancyra as if against Nestorius himself – like Proclus did in Constantinople[510] – but rather after the deposition, when the use of Nestorius' name to stand for divergent Christologies was spreading. In both homilies, the abundant Christological passages would fit an ongoing involvement, lenience or even acceptance by a good proportion of the audience of divergent views, requiring specific catechesis. The absence of Nestorius' name in Homily V does not hinder postdating it to Ephesus, and may indicate that Theodotus noticed his audience not associating Nestorius' name with the theological issues he wanted to address, especially if the Christological debate had developed independently of Nestorius' writings.

[504] R. Caro, *La homilética mariana griega* (1972), 173.

[505] *Ibid.*, 177, 181. See p. 108 on the problems raised by the text reproduced in PG 77, 1389D-1412B.

[506] M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 246 claims it ought to be dated earlier than orally suggested by Jouassard to the years immediately before the council, see also G. Jouassard, 'Marie' (1949), 109-11.

[507] M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 246-8.

[508] Inferable from unconvincing accusations like ACO I 1/7, 96, 32ff., *cf.* p. 22.

[509] Direct apostrophe: Homily IV, PG77, 1400A; δυσώνυμος, Homily IV.7, PG77, 1400A.

[510] N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 56, M. Redies, 'Kyrill und Nestorius' (1998), 200-1. Also, M. Simonetti, 'Alcune osservazioni sul monofisismo di Cirillo' (1982), 496 (footnote 10).

Furthermore, in Ancyra, Theodotus may have been more concerned to correct theology than to pursue a campaign against Nestorius, and mentioning the name could, especially until 433, alienate those who still hoped for his return to the Constantinopolitan see. At this early stage, labelling the heresy after Nestorius was not yet standard, and a law enforced in 436,[511] almost a *damnatio memoriae*, tried unsuccessfully to prevent it.

It seems to me more likely that, after his return from Ephesus, having a better knowledge of the key points of Nestorius' arguments, Theodotus could attack them. Homilies IV and V have some explicit references to views which were imputed to Nestorius[512] which are absent of Homilies I and II,[513] and seem to allude to the Cyrillian 'Nestorian' excerpts and the guiding 'interpretation' of the Cyrillian refutations of their 'errors', as often transmitted juxtaposed to them.[514] Other Nestorian ideas or the context of the excerpts can hardly be seen in Theodotus' texts. The arguments against deviating Christological views are interspersed in longer and freer exegetical and fictional passages dedicated to the occasion.[515]

From these considerations, an alternative picture may be hypothesised. Before June 431, Christological problems in Ancyra led Theodotus to compose Homilies I and II, as part of his regular preaching. When in town,[516] he performed the sacred mysteries in a church perhaps attended by a large part of the population, since in the capital of a less central province, he hardly could be distant and unreachable,[517] or be delegating his duties if he was attentive to his episcopal tasks. Then, the prolonged absence of at least five months[518] during the council period of 431 must have been noticed: the faithful may have been

[511] ACO I 1/3, 69ff. See also ACO I 4, xi-xiii and L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 275-6.

[512] *E.g. Theotokos*: PG77, 4394B, conceiving incarnate λόγος: M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 225, 40-55.

[513] Theodotus' displays in *Exp. symb.*, Homilies IV and V a confidence in exploring the Cyrillian caricature of Nestorius' writings which is absent of Homilies I and II. It is more reasonable to gather that Theodotus' was worried with pre-Ephesus 431 'Nestorianism', than to blame his early apprehension of Nestorius' ideas. See G.L. Castro, *Teodoto di Ancira* (1992), 71.

[514] Treatises against heretics frequently centred on refutation of excerpts, selections and collections thereof. Although the treatises against Nestorius which several bishops, often independently, wrote postdate the council, Cyril's third letter already resembled this format, also employed in the session of 22 June. See A. van Roey, 'Le florilège nestorien de l'Adversus Nestorium' (1981), L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 68-9, R. MacMullen, *Voting about God* (2006). For the use of *florilegia* in Cyril's pre-conciliar 'treatises' like *Coll. Vat.* 150, see T. Graumann, *Die Kirche der Väter* (2002), 324ff.

[515] PG77, 11390D; M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 224.

[516] Conciliar canons limited the periods of absence. See C. Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity* (2005), 265-6.

[517] See the characterisation of a bishop like Ephrem in F. Cassingena-Trévedy, 'Les Églises syriaques à travers l'hymnographie d'Éphrem' (2009), 237-9.

[518] June-October.

left in ignorance of the matter of the synod, but they must have known that their bishop had been invited to attend a council, on a scale and of an importance not seen since Nicaea. They may have received some news about events in Ephesus, but hardly much bona fide information, in view of all imposed obstacles.[519] Upon Theodotus' return, Ancyrans were probably eager to know what happened and with what outcome. He may have felt at ease to say that the sanctioned orthodoxy was very much what their bishop had always preached. There was no need to dwell on the recent theological discussions, even if they upheld what he advocated. His participation in the council could have assured him that by preaching as before he was contributing to the salvation of his congregation in keeping them away from error. Theodotus may have obtained in Ephesus, perhaps from the conversations with Nestorius, cleaner formulations of the errors faced by his generation, allowing him to engage more incisively with them as needed.

The council gave Theodotus a pattern into which he could fit the challenges he faced in Ancyra, and sanctioned calling the Christological deviations after Nestorius, which he did in Homily IV.[520] Theodotus, who continued to promote avoidance of reasoning in Homilies IV and V, would also not detail the heretical views, which probably remained unclear for most people.[521]

The Council of Ephesus has been seen as a watershed in the thematic emphasis of the theological debate, providing a clear dichotomy between a Marian aspect in 428-30 followed by a Christological formulation.[522] Actually, Marian *Theotokos* homilies, which were perhaps ground-breaking and particularly polemical in pre-Ephesian years, remained common, and the extant sermons, albeit quite numerous, probably do not attest how pervasive they were afterwards. The clear division[523] does not hold for all areas, and in the East 'Mary *Theotokos*' remained central,[524] even when decontextualised.[525] Thus, the predominance of the *Theotokos*-theme is not a reliable argument for dating a homily.

[519] N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 72.

[520] PG77, 1399A.

[521] The official statements, by church or state, barely mentioned more than Nestorius' deposition. Documents with more theological content, like the proceedings or the Cyrillian letters, were perhaps not circulated widely.

[522] R. Caro, *La homilética mariana griega* (1972), 181.

[523] The 'Mary *Theotokos*' discussion may seem to retreat in importance after the Council of Ephesus I if the focus lies on events and works which are leading to Chalcedon, and from thence to other discussions on orthodoxy particularly significant for the West. See M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 238.

[524] The imperially backed fostering of Marian devotion contributed to its spread, see references on p. 27.

[525] *E.g.* 'It is enough for complete reassurance of sound worship to consider and call the all-holy Virgin God-bearer', Photius, *cod.* 228.248a32-4 (Ephrem of Antioch), R. Henry (ed.), *Photius. Bibliothèque IV* (1965), 123. See also L.M. Peltomaa, *The Image of the Virgin Mary in the Akathistos Hymn* (2001), 79-83, 98, D. Krausmüller, 'Theotokos-diadochos' (2006), 35.

Nestorius and the Orientals repeatedly accepted, albeit conditionally, the *Theotokos* title,[526] but nevertheless after Ephesus it became an established anti-Nestorian topos, and a slogan for orthodoxy. The Council of Ephesus sanctioned the trend of Marian devotion (which had been brewing not only in lay Christianity[527]) to be celebrated in preaching, and increasingly in dedicated solemnities.

In Ephesus, Theodotus perhaps came to know a developed and elaborate rhetoric for the exaltation of Mary,[528] not very unlike his earlier and probably textually successful efforts.[529] By focusing on Mary, and figures like Joseph, especially from angles which linked them to trends in popular devotion, he could convey key points of orthodox theology while diverting his audience from noticing its inherent problems. He could speak against tainted views without making it clear how the matter under attack could fit together and be turned into a competing view of the faith. The extensive literary elaboration of the character of Joseph in Homily V, with narrative details which go far beyond the scarce references in the canonical books of scripture,[530] suggests the existence of a popular devotional practice related to him, which Theodotus chose to exploit.[531]

Some parts of Homily IV celebrated the council with reasonably direct references to the achievements of the sessions.[532] The participation at the council is unlikely to have motivated Theodotus to change significantly the content and style of his preaching. In Ephesus, he probably became acquainted with a wider range of homiletic practices. Perhaps, in the encomium of Mary in Homily V, he also emulated flourished passages of other homilies, and celebrated in this way the Ephesian Council, if he ever preached Homily V as transmitted.

This chronology of the homilies can accommodate that Theodotus was aware of trends in the Christological discussion after the council. In the deliberations and works which led to the Formula of Reunion and to Chalcedon, theological reflection on Christology predominated, and it is of central importance for a historical view of the period.[533] It is not clear if the debates and doctrinal texts

[526] ACO I 1/2, 13, 30-1; ACO I 1/5, 12-4, 132; ACO I 1/1, 95, 15ff.

[527] 'Popular Christianity' stands for the living, daily basis experienced religion, so that 'popular' does not fail to include the elites. In this context, especially, scholarship has stressed that the court was among the early champions of the Theotokos cult.

[528] *E.g.* ACO I 1/1, 103ff., ACO I 1/2, 91, 22ff., ACO I 1/2, 102ff.

[529] ACO I 1/2, 74, 20ff.

[530] M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 226-9.

[531] In the dialogues between preacher and the (fictional) character of Joseph one can see examples of the seeds for the religious dramas which would become part of Byzantine literature. Compare Chrysippus Hierosolymitanus, *In sanctam Mariam*, M. Jugie (ed.), *Homélies mariales* (1926), 296-7, 336-7. See M. Fassler, 'The first Marian feast' (2001), 56-7.

[532] *E.g.* PG77, 1396C, 1402B.

[533] R. Caro, *La homilética mariana griega* (1972), 181.

were equally relevant for daily life in 'distant' dioceses. For Theodotus, who had already faced the discussion in relative isolation, the Christological debate perhaps seemed to be reaching new heights and becoming globally recognised as significant. Theodotus did not fail to engage in this new stage. It was no longer a problem in his diocese, which he might think best to tackle locally, by preaching against the mistakes and in favour of the orthodox views. The debate had become a matter for the church leaders, discussed by bishops and recognised theologians. The circulation of texts could contribute to discredit or support other views. Further formats, could then seem appropriate, for example, theological treatises, such as the two extant works by Theodotus.

Reception of Theodotus' conciliar homilies

The subsequent transmission of Theodotus' conciliar homilies depended on the inclusion in collections of conciliar documents. To discuss the reception of Theodotus' works is tantamount to apprehending his influence and how later generations saw him. Theodotus' contribution and reputation did not depend much on what singled him out,[534] but on what made him into a good example of what was expected of a Cyrillian bishop, as it can be judged from his participation at the council and contributions to its collections of documents.

Focusing on the reception of the works spans centuries and generations, and is much related to their transmission and spread. There are three main points to be addressed. What can be said about the opinion which Theodotus' generation and those with possible direct knowledge of him had of his works; secondly, about the motivation to include Theodotus' homilies in conciliar collections, and lastly about how later generations with no other source of information but what was in the conciliar collections judged Theodotus.

Early allusions to Theodotus' writings

After the Council of Ephesus, Theodotus still exchanged letters,[535] 'published' theological treatises and preached. He seems not to be mentioned by name, except once by John of Antioch.[536] To judge Theodotus' influence, especially in the first decades after Ephesus I, the few occurrences of quotations and allusions are more relevant than the evidence presented by the transmission of Theodotus' writings. One instance has received attention from

[534] Any details of his biography were lost, and the slightly distinctive marks of his theology passed unnoticed.

[535] See above, on the fragment to Vitale and Cyril's letter, pp. 87ff.

[536] ACO I 4, 80, 2.

scholarship:[537] for many centuries it has been noted that the incipit of Proclus' Homily IV[538] is identical with Theodotus' Homily I, and the exordia share several sentences.[539] Proclus' Homily IV is usually dated after the council,[540] and Proclus may have been aware of the conciliar significance of Theodotus' text which would eventually lead to its inclusion in important conciliar collections. Theodotus' prominent role in Ephesus, and especially the place his homily, by all account predating the council, has in the compilations, makes it probable that he was the original author of the lines shared between the two texts.[541] Since Proclus did not attend the council, he could not have heard Theodotus' Homily I there. The homily could have been known in Constantinople even before the council by a pattern of circulation of written-down homilies similar to that which made Nestorius' works known in Egypt. It is more likely that the exchange is linked to the aftermath of Nestorius' resignation. During the last stages of the Council of Ephesus, Proclus apparently was in Constantinople and does not seem to have met the delegations in Chalcedon. They may have met when the Cyrillian delegates went to Constantinople for Maximian's consecration.[542] Theodotus and Proclus may have heard each other preach or exchanged their works.

Beyond the identical passages of the first paragraphs of both homilies, the similarities encompass parallels of structure and content at all stages which suggest that beyond the resemblance which genre and theme would have warranted, Proclus emulated Theodotus' text to surpass it.[543] Perhaps Proclus not only explored a written homily which he had in hands, but spoke to an audience which knew enough of Theodotus' earlier homily so that it could appreciate the emulation, the oblique references and puns. Proclus' Homily IV is a Nativity Homily, and therefore cannot have been preached while the delegations were in Chalcedon and Constantinople in 431. It is usually dated to his Constantinopolitan episcopacy, after 434. In common with Theodotus' Homilies IV and V, tentatively dated after 431, the development of Proclus' Homily IV has few

[537] See especially N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 238, but also R. Caro, *La homilética mariana griega* (1972), 168. Note that M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 15, dismissed any further similarity, beyond the initial lines.

[538] It goes beyond the scope of this work to analyse that Proclus' Homily IV is also included in *Paris. graec.* 1171.

[539] See S.J. Voicu, 'Note su un'omelia pseudocrisostomica per il natale' (1992), 355 on Proclus' intertextuality.

[540] N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 214.

[541] Theodotus is unlikely to have heard Proclus' sermon during a visit to Constantinople before 431. The scarce pointers limit the inferences about church political echoes and implications.

[542] On the objections against Proclus as successor of Nestorius, see N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 73-5.

[543] A detailed study shows, for example, the correlation between the use of 'tree of life', 'incapacity of nature', 'proof of a wonder by acceptance of other wonders', 'significance of the magi's gifts'.

explicit Christological digressions.[544] Since Proclus seems a forerunner of a 'middle way' Chalcedonic theological formulation,[545] and Theodotus leans to monophysitism,[546] the emulation was perhaps not 'only' rhetorical. The similarity of the homilies may hint that Proclus thought he and Theodotus shared views. Alternatively, it may be posited that Proclus wished to show how he could surpass a distinguished model, departing from the same point, without incurring in Theodotus' monophysite tendency.

Compilation of collections

At first glance all homilies in conciliar collections, especially Homilies III and VI, which have in their first delivery an inherent character of persuading meeting bishops, seem to fit into the following pattern:

> The spoken Christian homily must have been one of the fundamental vehicles of persuasion and information [...]. But, [...] written texts of homilies, when incorporated in dossiers bearing on disputed theological issues, contributed important material for persuasion, and could be laid before secular holders of power as before meeting bishops.[547]

Actually, the whole characterisation hardly fits Homily III, and even less Homily VI. For instance, it is unlikely that Homily III was included with minutes sent to the Emperor Theodosius II, especially during 431,[548] or to Rome.[549] The quotation also seems applicable to Homily I, and perhaps to Homily II. However, a reader of the *Collectio Vaticana* would have read Cyril's and Proclus' homilies before coming across Theodotus' text. It has many similarities to Proclus' Homily I, but lacks the historical significance of the sermon of the future bishop of Constantinople which had been an important event in bringing the controversy about, and was perhaps as such included among the first documents placed before the minutes. The rubric of Proclus' homily refers to the delivery in Nestorius' presence, without further details.[550] In late antique collections of documents which seem to have been made in the guise of legal compilations, that is, in a pattern similar to that of the Theodosian and Justinian Codes, the rubrics of the documents shed light on the role a text was meant to have. However, the reliability of this information is questionable, considering the many cases where the rubric duplicates details found in the document or in

[544] N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 213.
[545] See *ibid.*, 111, on Proclus *Arm.*
[546] See the section on p. 152.
[547] F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), 33.
[548] I. Rucker, 'Ephesinische Konzilsakten in armenischgeorgischer Überlieferung' (1930), 82 on the disadvantages of Theodotus' defence of Cyril.
[549] *E.g.* absent from *Coll. Cas.*, see F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), 168ff.
[550] ACO I 1/1, 103, 2-3.

well known sources. Thus, for example, the rubric of *Coll. Vat.* 19 confirms information found elsewhere,[551] and the rubrics of Theodotus' homilies may well have been deduced from the text.[552]

In the collections, the function of the festal and polemical homilies remains elusive. The Armenian-Georgian transmission of conciliar collections emphasises the theological importance of Theodotus' Homilies I and II and of Proclus' Homily, as being decidedly anti-Nestorian but also tackling other problems.[553]

Theodotus' homilies are always placed together in the Greek conciliar collections:[554]

CPG	6125	6126	6127	6132
	V73	V72	V71	
	A145	A144		
		S107	S106	
			Q4	Q13

In comparison, the order of Cyril's homilies varies more and they are not always included as a set:

CPG	5253	5246	5245	5250	5251	5248	5252 (frag.)
	V75	V76	V77	V78	V79	V80	
				A117	A136		
	S80	S78	S81	S79	S109	S82	
				S118			
	TC53	TC51	TC54	TC52	TC55	n/a	

Only *Collectio Vaticana* has three of Theodotus' homilies. The hypothesis that the conciliar Homily III motivated the inclusion of I and II, enhancing the link of authorship and minimising the importance of the redelivery in Ephesus mentioned by the rubric, is weakened by the *Collectio Atheniensis*, where Homily III

[551] See N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 55-8.

[552] See p. 96. The transmission of homilies in the collections of conciliar documents at least prompts us to question commonly held assumptions about the quality of the text available to us as largely unedited, the work of stenographers, without revision of the author. See also A. Merkt, 'Mündlichkeit: Ein Problem der Hermeneutik' (1997), 77-8.

[553] I. Rucker, 'Ephesinische Konzilsakten in armenischgeorgischer Überlieferung' (1930), 40.

[554] See also ACO I 1/4, xxiv-xxvi, and I. Rucker, 'Ephesinische Konzilsakten in armenisch-georgischer Überlieferung' (1930), 40-1, 82-4. Abbreviations: CPG: M. Geerard (ed.), *A Cyrillo Alexandrino ad Iohannem Damascenum* (1979); V: *Coll. Vaticana*; A: *Coll. Atheniensis*; S: *Coll. Seguierana*; TC: Latin *Coll. Turonensis/Contiana*; Q: *Qērellos*. Notice that *Coll. Vaticana* (Codex Vaticanus 830) is a manuscript from the fifteenth century, *Coll. Seguierana* (Codex Parisinus Coislinianus 32) is dated to the eleventh century.

is not included. Furthermore, in no collection are Theodotus' texts near to Proclus' Homily,[555] which forms part of the narrative background for the occurrence of the Council of Ephesus, and features in *Coll. Vat.* and *Ath.* among letters exchanged before the council.[556] Some of these were mentioned in the minutes, and it is likely that this set of texts had been assembled before the session, to have ready material from which to draw accusations and arguments. It seems that the most useful ones, or those which ended up being used were pushed to the extremes of this pile. In short, Theodotus' homilies prior to the council were not included in this group of texts assembled in advance. The compilers seem not to have thought that it belonged there. This suggests that Theodotus' engagement against Nestorius had no significant impact on the events leading up to the council, and that his activity had not been widely known in Constantinople and the other main sees, rather had probably been restricted to Ancyra. Theodotus may have brought the homilies with him to Ephesus – increasing the likelihood that they were texts he had revised.

In all Greek collections, Rheginus' Homily[557] is followed by one or more of Theodotus' Homilies. In the Latin *Coll. Tur./Cont.*, however, Theodotus' Homilies I and II (as TC56 and 57) precede Rheginus', and appear in the order which was adopted for modern editions on which the *Patrologia Graeca* relied. In all Greek collections, Theodotus' homilies are followed by Acacius of Melitene's (V74 S108 A146), which is absent from the Latin collections. In *Coll. Vat.* and *Seg.* this is followed by a homily by Cyril. Only in *Coll. Vat.* is this Cyril's Homily I. In *Seg.* it is Cyril's fifth homily (V79), which is placed separate from the other five homilies (S78-82) – their order is different from *Coll. Vat.*, and they are apart from both minutes and other homilies. In the Latin *Coll. Tur./Cont.*, however, the homilies by Cyril that are included[558] are all grouped together, and come next to the other homilies, before Theodotus' and Rheginus'. Cyril's homilies are often[559] contrasted to those of 'others', and their relative position in the collections is connected to the 'kirchenpolitische Einstellung' of the collections, especially in attempts to reduce Cyril's dogmatic influence. Homilies by 'others' would convey the content of Cyril's orthodoxy but not pinpointed as Cyril's.

This interweaving with Cyril's homilies, coming before or after those by Theodotus' and others, suggests they were all rated and included similarly. The nearness to the minutes of the session of 22 June[560] hints at an early inclusion

[555] V19, S93 – *i.e.* near the other homilies – A19, and also in Latin collections.

[556] The *contestatio* (ACO I 1/1, 101f.) can easily be considered an open letter.

[557] V70 S105 A143, always after the conciliar letter V69. Also TC58.

[558] The sixth *Coll. Vat.* 80, 136 is not included.

[559] I. Rucker, 'Ephesinische Konzilsakten in armenischgeorgischer Überlieferung' (1930), 82.

[560] An argument based on the placement of the minutes for the other sessions after these homilies (*e.g.* sessions of 16, 17 July in V87-90 and sessions of 10, 11 July in V106) is weakened by their juxtaposition to the June session in collections S (resp. S54-9 and S62-4), A (resp.

in the conciliar collections for Ephesus I, or at least at a similar date for both Theodotus' and Cyril's texts.

It has been mentioned above that only those of Theodotus' homilies delivered prior to the council are included in *Coll. Ath.* They are included with the rubrics concerning their redelivery in Ephesus, to the council. Their inclusion among sermons and homilies which were delivered in Ephesus increases the probability that there was a public reading of Theodotus' Homilies I and II, of enough significance to motivate the compilers to include them.

The omission of Theodotus' Homily III from *Coll. Ath.* and the Latin tradition and, more importantly, of Homily VI from all extant Greek and Latin collections, should not be imputed to their content, style, or ties to a specific moment, since these aspects characterise also, for example, Rheginus' sermon, which is in all the collections considered. The polemic and laudatory content of Theodotus' Homily III finds parallels in documents in all collections, and does not seem to have been decisive for its non-inclusion either. It seems all attempts to explain the inclusion of documents in the conciliar collections fail to be comprehensive. For example, the absence of all of Cyril's homilies from *Coll. Ath.*, as well as Theodotus' Homily III, could suggest a deliberate lack of Cyrillian propaganda of the *Coll. Ath.* However, Acacius' sermon[561] is as much that as Theodotus' Homily III, and is in the collection.

The strong and direct praise of Cyril which characterises Homily VI may nevertheless have initially prevented its inclusion in the first versions of documents compiled about the council, which were meant for the court in Constantinople or for western bishops, especially in Rome. The same characteristics probably motivated its placement in a collection strongly centred around Cyril, like the *Qērellos* collection.[562] A homily by 'another' with an explicit association of the faith ratified by Ephesus to Cyril's authority would be amiss in collections aiming to minimise this connection.[563]

As far as the reception of the homilies is concerned, the composition of the collection then translated into Ethiopic shows that for a time at least compilers saw a unifying aspect between the conciliar homilies. Ethiopic translators and copyists rated Homilies III and VI similarly, but differentiated them from Homilies I and II, although similarly linked to delivery in Ephesus to the bishops.

A37-8, 41-2), as well as in the Latin, respectively TC39 (plus *Veronensi* 20) and TC35 (correcting therefore the chronology).

[561] ACO I 1/2, 91, 18ff.

[562] Treatises, like Cyril's 'On the right faith', are also included in *Qērellos*. This association of treatises to conciliar documents in their early reception would have warranted a discussion of Theodotus' two treatises in this study. When the Syriac manuscripts of the *Adversus Nestorium* are edited it will be possible to gain much insight from the arguments Theodotus developed more deeply in his treatises, and from the comparison to the presentation of similar content in different format.

[563] I. Rucker, 'Ephesinische Konzilsakten in armenischgeorgischer Überlieferung' (1930), 82.

Also the Armenian-Georgian tradition set them apart, including Homily III as an after thought, placed after the material about the delegations, so far at the end of the collection, that once it may have been followed by Homily VI.[564]

The core of the part dedicated to the Council of Ephesus in the *Qērellos* collection, which is available in several manuscripts, focuses on conciliar homilies.[565] Comparing the Ethiopic translation of Homily III with its original Greek shows significant differences,[566] warning against attempts to reconstruct the Greek text of Homily VI, and its use in detailed studies which would rely on particular words.

The analysis of Theodotus' conciliar homilies, including their links to other genres, suggests that he was actively involved in persuading the Cyrillian bishops of the uprightness of their decision, of the faith they had espoused, and therefore to insist on some relevant Christological topics so as to clarify them. Redelivery of Homilies I and II could aid this persuasion. Lengthier exposition could elucidate some theological matters, or guide reflections. If they already served this function when the bishops were gathered for the council, they may have been included in the collections with the expectation of functioning similarly and with like efficiency. Therefore, although Homilies I and II probably did not figure in the pile of 'documents at hand' for any of the sessions, they fitted into the model of supporting conciliar documents.[567] The explicit mention that their delivery was by 'reading' may echo the developing pattern of relying on written documents from recognised theological authorities, living or deceased, as authoritative, so as to guide decisions. The reference in the rubrics to the gathered council suggests that Homilies I and II were delivered in the wake of the session of 22 June. Then, they may have influenced the bishops during the later sessions of the First Council of Ephesus, not only in their persistence in defending the outcome of the session of 22 June, but also in the theology which they upheld, and for which they should advocate in their sees.

Transmission in Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages

The practice in church councils from Ephesus I onwards to quote preceding councils by the inclusion of bulky excerpts of collections of documents related to previous synods, drawing from both minutes and included documents, kept some of Theodotus' works in circulation for a few centuries, accessible to a

[564] *Ibid.*, 81-2.

[565] A. Dillmann, *Chrestomathia Aethiopica* (1866) first published Theodotus' Homily VI in the West, and was followed by a translation into German in S. Euringer, 'Übersetzung der Homilien' (1943), 131-4. B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979) provided a better critical edition and improved translation.

[566] B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979).

[567] See quote of F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), 33 on p. 120.

sizeable audience. Documents were brought to the attention of the gathered bishops by being read aloud or circulated, and many were then copied into the proceedings or annexed to the collections. Theodotus had contributed to the solidification of this approach by speaking in favour of following the teaching of authoritative authors, and may have seen works he provided being included in the Ephesian collections.

Within this pattern, the most extensive statement about Theodotus comes from the II Council of Nicaea, in 787.[568] There, the deacon Epiphanius gave evidence of Theodotus' good reputation at his time, as the author of a rich anti-heretical and homiletic oeuvre, to whom nothing outrageous could be attributed.[569] Soon afterwards, an extensive quotation of a passage of the doubtful Homily IV[570] occurred in Nicephorus of Constantinople's *Antirrhetica*.[571] Nicephorus, who died in 829, may have worked with an original which identified this homily as authored by Theodotus[572] or by Amphilochius of Iconium.[573] In the tenth and eleventh centuries the memory of Theodotus is witnessed by the scribes attributing all these works to him.

The occurrence of all the long homilies in collections of homilies[574] attests their diffusion beyond the audience of conciliar documents. It suggests the reading and possible liturgical reuse of Theodotus' festal homilies at least until the middle Byzantine period. Also the transmission of Homilies III and VI in the Ethiopic version present in several manuscripts points to a significant use of conciliar homilies at least during the early Byzantine period.

Theodotus' waning reputation in Greek orthodoxy was probably due to the fact that apparently there were never more than a few written works under his name, associated with the even fewer 'remarkable' deeds which could be linked to him, and the absolute absence of anecdotal or miraculous facts about him. Nevertheless, Theodotus' engagement for orthodoxy was remembered through the record of his conciliar pro-Cyrillian activity, drawing from both minutes and homilies. The long tradition of reading his works which were transmitted in Greek in agreement with Chalcedonian orthodoxy led to sporadic uses of

[568] G.D. Mansi, *Ab anno 787* (1767), 312C.

[569] See also O. Bardenhewer (ed.), *Marienpredigten aus der Väterzeit* (1934), 197, M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 223, R. Caro, *La homilética mariana griega* (1972), 157.

[570] PG77, 1393CD.

[571] J.-B. Pitra, *Spicilegium solesmense* (1852), 349. See p. 108 on the authenticity of Homily IV.

[572] The tradition of Paris. graec. 1171.

[573] The tradition witnessed by Vatic. gr. 1673.

[574] Except the short – and polemic – Homilies III and VI, all other homilies, which can be considered long festal sermons, are either only in collections of homilies, or, in the case of Homilies I and II, also in such manuscripts. See M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 221-3.

titles of sainthood.[575] This was feasible,[576] since only a significant distancing from the text brings awareness that *e.g.* the use of φύσις without further qualifications may mean a greater monophysitism than Chalcedon consented, suggesting Theodotus was not 'orthodox'.

However, in the first generations after Theodotus, he is more frequently mentioned in connection to monophysitism. Early in the sixth century, the monophysite author Severus of Antioch quoted in the *Liber contra impium Grammaticum* extensively from Theodotus' Homily I,[577] and, in *Orationes ad Nephalium*, he quoted from all the 'conciliar' Homilies I-III.[578] In these works, Theodotus usually comes after Cyril and Proclus among the main witnesses for orthodoxy.

Next to the Syriac and Ethiopic evidence for his enduring reputation, there are also some passages of Theodotus' works in Arabic, mostly without exact attribution. Homily I was translated as being by Theodoret of Cyrrhus, and there are six fragments of Homily II, one fragment of Homily III and an unidentified fragment.[579] Thus, also in the Arabic tradition only 'conciliar' homilies seem to have been known.

[575] PG77, 1309A. See also G.L. Castro, 'Citazione di uno Ps.-Teodoto d'Ancira' (1992), 365 on the familiarity with Theodotus' writings and theology from 8CE onwards.

[576] See p. 174.

[577] J. Lebon, *Severi Antiocheni Liber contra impium grammaticum* (1929, 1933; 1938): CSCO93, 321, 25 - 324, 22; CSCO101, 336, 15 - 338, 2; CSCO111, 118, 7-16.

[578] J. Lebon, *Severi Antiocheni Orationes ad Nephalium* (1949): CSCO119, 33, 1 - 34, 14, 48, 25 - 49, 2. In these passages, Severus is quoting authoritative statements of fathers like Cyril and Proclus. See also M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 250 and W. Wright, *Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts* (2002), 553.

[579] See G. Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur* (1944), 366 and *id.*, 'Zwei dogmatische Florilegien der Kopten' (1937), 376, as well as M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 250 and W. Wright, *Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts* (2002), 553.

3. Character and theology of Theodotus' homilies

I see this assembly [...] strengthened by the *fight* for the faith[. ...] Rejoice, you pure *sons of the faith*, rejoice, that you see Christ glorified![1]

These opening lines of Homily VI state clearly Theodotus' apprehension of 'faith'. There is no reference to a correct, proper, better, or right faith. It is absolute, and therefore allows no degrees or qualifications. It is the faith authorised principally by the Nicene fathers and those who accord with them. When Theodotus speaks of 'pure sons of the faith', he brings into his speech the notion that the faithful have to be kept pure or purified by cleansing from heretical individuals, as done by the Cyrillian Council in their sessions.[2] Analogously, when defending the excision of a sick member in Homily III, Theodotus claims the bishops have become purer by getting rid of a company which did not hold to the faith.[3]

This chapter begins with an analysis of Homilies III and VI considering the setting in their first delivery to the bishops gathered for a council. References to social issues which affected the way Theodotus approached theological and pastoral issues are discussed here because they usually occur alongside the more important argumentative meanings of the passages related to the achievements of the synod. The following sections stem from the close reading of individual passages which highlights diverse ways in which Theodotus allowed his main topics to resonate with conventional ideas of late antiquity. His audience, sharing the cultural background, may have picked up one or more of these undertones.

How Theodotus spoke to the bishops about the church suggests his views on ecclesiology and his own role, and how a bishop ought to talk about an institution of which he was part. It is then possible to analyse better what these text show about the genre of homiletics in the second section, before addressing Theodotus' theology. The aim of the last two sections is not to fill in lacunae in our picture of 420-30 Christological trends, or to present a rounded whole of Theodotus' theology, but only to clarify the prime topics of his conciliar sermons and deduce from them the likely motivation for his preaching. Theodotus apparently considered one particular theological apprehension of the incarnation necessary for the salvation of humanity and of individual human beings, and that the main concern of a religious person, particularly of a bishop, was to assist in the process and remove any stumbling blocks. It led him to

[1] B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979) (henceforth, *Qērellos* 4.1), 122, 3ff.

[2] Nestorius' deposition (ACO I 1/2, 54, 28), and excommunication of his supporters (ACO I 1/3, 27, 17-9).

[3] ACO I 1/2, 72, 3.

express this need and present his understanding of relevant, perhaps disputed, issues even before an audience of fellow bishops. This allowed the inclusion, in the discussion and in the collections, of diverging 'details', some of which would eventually become the object of later controversies.[4] He, however, meant to uphold the univocality of the shared faith. The generally Cyrillian character of Theodotus' theology[5] is evident. The themes and images in Cyril *Epistulae* 1, 2 pervade Theodotus' homilies. They also contain in a nutshell most of Cyril's vastly greater output, including his later Christological outreaches to both Antiochene and pre-monophysitism-monophysites.[6] For the purpose of this study, the homiletic shaping and representation of the theological themes and the likely motivation for such choices are in the foreground. In this perspective, parallels to Cyril matter if the audience recollected them and was aware of the authorship. Theodotus' rationale for conciliar homiletics is inextricably linked to his theology since it entails that all must hold, defend and spread the faith. A preacher who understood it properly could (and thus had to) disseminate it by instructing and persuading his audience. Bishops could (and had to) protect the faith and the faithful by restraining misguiding preachers. As preachers, they must believe correctly, and know how to communicate the faith. Theodotus' conciliar sermons address his demands manifoldly: he teaches and invites the recognition of a shared Christological model; he exhorts them to the same task; he provides sample patterns of argumentation, also found in his homilies read in Ephesus.

Church and council

The conciliar setting is present in at least three levels of the communication structure of the homilies: emisor, message and receiver are part or interact with the council.[7] This first section shows how Theodotus represented the church and the council when addressing its members. The result is a clearer representation of his understanding of the authority of the church as an institution and of the role of bishops. This is followed by a discussion about Theodotus' perspective on leadership among equals, since much in Homilies III and VI is structured as a praise of Cyril. Analysing the claims of authority in the sources points to Theodotus' idea of Christian holy priesthood.

[4] See p. 120.

[5] M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 247, M. Simonetti, 'Alcune osservazioni sul monofisismo di Cirillo' (1982), 193.

[6] *Ibid.*, 194-5.

[7] The emisor, Theodotus, presents himself as a member of the council, he speaks about the council, and he speaks to members of the council.

Addressing bishops

In Homily III, Theodotus resorted to an interweaving of the medical, husbandry and teacher similes as well as to the image of the prophet[8] to speak about bishops, especially those gathered for a council and faced with the decision of excluding a metropolitan from communion. The structure of Theodotus' description of the Council of Ephesus by the doctor simile[9] seems to fit into the following pattern:

a) just as illness brings death, so error, that is deviation from the straight and correct God-given path, leads to damnation;[10]
b) a divinely established church[11] is entitled and bound to correct this.[12] The reference to the 'holy priesthood' is,[13] at once, to the whole church and specifically to Theodotus' audience, which was the bishops of the majoritarian council. They are representatives of the whole priesthood and church, and their decisions are divinely sanctioned. This collective reference implies a shift from an individual soul, which is a more usual realm[14] for the medical simile, to a collective soul (body) of the church;
c) on the other hand, the error is narrowed down to an individual, so that Nestorius,[15] who had been condemned, is meant by who 'was affected by the suffering'.[16] Deposed from the see of Constantinople he is no longer part of the holy priesthood; excluded from communion, he is no longer part of the church; placed outside the church, his discourse would lack authority and no longer be 'contagious';[17]
d) this excision is founded on the principle of lesser evil. Theodotus discusses at length[18] this common aspect of the medical simile.[19]

[8] Most noteworthy in the exegesis of *Jer.* 1:10, ACO I 1/2, 71, 32 - 72, 3, is the opportunity to enhance the 'all-septic' purity of the church, its universality and primacy over secular governments, and the 'genealogical succession' going back to divine appointment.

[9] J.LR. Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication* (2006), 89. For the development since the Pauline letters, with particular emphasis on the Cappadocian contribution for an indirect way to speak about the church and clerics, see M. Dörnemann, *Krankheit und Heilung* (2003).

[10] ACO I 1/2, 71, 23-4.

[11] Also in Homily VI, *Qērellos* 4.1, 130, 5-8.

[12] ACO I 1/2, 71, 24 - 72, 2.

[13] ACO I 1/2, 71, 25.

[14] Usually, the language expressing the image reflected an one-to-one relation between doctor and patient.

[15] ACO I 1/2, 72, 2-5.

[16] ACO I 1/2, 71, 25-6.

[17] ACO I 1/2, 71, 27. See also p. v.

[18] ACO I 1/2, 71, 28-72, 2.

[19] M. Dörnemann, *Krankheit und Heilung* (2003), 325-6. Although Theodotus' rhetoric emphasises the sorrow and weeping of employing such harsh measures, it is a discourse justifying an action which in all its definiteness belies an understanding of the use of the simile as in *ibid.*, 329.

Theodotus identifies the need for expertise to diagnose and offer treatment against the evil and its spreading. To have and to share such knowledge brings the image of the doctor close to that of the teacher and educator. In parallel, since heresy is, in this case, a matter of incorrect apprehension and teaching, imparting correct beliefs is at once remedy and cure. In the conciliar context, the good teacher is Cyril, as made explicit in Homily VI.[20] Theodotus also mentions or alludes to the relation of doctor and teacher to Christ, to the ongoing divine influence in the world.[21] The medicine and the knowledge which doctor and teacher have are imparted by God. The appropriate healing is replacement of wrong theological ideas by the proper understanding of divine matters. In a religious context, instruction, and even more, divine grace, can revert any corruption. However, echoing another didactic topos, that any content once apprehended (by hearing, reading, thinking) has some lasting impact,[22] the purity of the faith and of the mind are jeopardised by the contact with impious discourses.

A twist for the use of the medical simile is the fictional character of Theodotus' discourse in Homily III. Although he speaks of healing and instructing, the antagonist of his discourse is not present, except in the 'you' of the fictional dialogues.[23] There is no chance that this preaching may be effective in the way Theodotus claims he aims for.

In Homily VI, Theodotus chooses a far more direct approach to address the bishops and refer to the church, abundantly using respectful episcopal titles. He begins claiming that his audience is 'cheerful and happy'.[24] The next sentences then point to the achievements of their fight for the faith as the reason why they ought to be that. It can be assumed that this is a faithful description of the state of mind of the audience. Thus, probably either the majority in the audience was unaware of or not troubled by present and future problems, such as the challenge posed by the Orientals, who in their conciliar session issued a deposition of Cyril and Memnon, or the likely consequences of having gone against the commands of the imperial administration and the injunctions of important members thereof. The celebratory mood is predominant during the first three sections of the homily. Its highest expression is the exhortation to 'rejoice now, and exult' at the end of section 2, an elaboration of the beginning. It also indicates that a new topic will be dealt with ('another joy'), which will change the tenor of the homily. Theodotus goes on listing facts worthy of celebration, and he choses expressions which say that they cause amazement, marvel, support,

[20] *Qērellos* 4.1, 124, 13.

[21] ACO I 1/2, 72, 11.

[22] For example, Plato *Protagoras*, 314b.

[23] In this way, Theodotus addresses Nestorius individually, according to the principles of the doctor simile. See M. Dörnemann, *Krankheit und Heilung* (2003), 333.

[24] *Qērellos* 4.1, 122, 3.

and strength. Theodotus' intention is to prepare his audience for further difficulties, mounting problems they were likely to face, and warn them that their struggle will go on. He concludes exhorting them:[25] 'Fight, my friends!', the fight for the faith which is an ongoing struggle, in which the bishops 'have fought well',[26] as Theodotus portrays at the beginning what they achieved. The main underlying reference is to the session of 22 June,[27] but also what contributed to it, like writings and actions in the preceding months and years. Since after the exordium Cyril is praised, his efforts are probably the main topics, but particularly those who engaged directly with Nestorius or 'Nestorians' could feel encompassed in the praise of their fight. The allusions brought into the homily by the reference to 'the fight' go beyond the session of 22 June, and are what the bishops have achieved together. Theodotus wishes to portray this as a success, at the same time as he readies them for the continuation of their struggle against heresy and those who oppose them personally.

Authority of the church

The authority of the church as an institution, and of its leaders (any and all bishops equally) was a matter of course for Theodotus. Even the Nicene creed, which he would use as benchmark for orthodoxy, had its authority from the fathers who had spoken it.[28] The images of the exalted status of priests and prophets are valid in the context of an authoritative church.[29] However, in view of the challenges posed by heresy brewing within its ranks, and by division, exemplified by the occurrence of parallel councils, Theodotus stressed the links which the orthodox church has to God both by its origin and through its continuing relation to him. The best example is the emphatic repetition that the orthodox bishops are in the present the 'rock', as Peter was in the New Testament.[30]

[25] *Qērellos* 4.1, 132, 3.

[26] *Qērellos* 4.1, 122, 4.

[27] Also Firmus' Homily, *Qērellos* 4.1, 134-7, celebrates the victory, that is, the deposition of Nestorius. The explicit description of Nestorius' fall has led I. Rucker, 'Ephesinische Konzilsakten in armenischgeorgischer Überlieferung' (1930), 83-4 to suggest a date after 431, yet still delivered in Ephesus. A comparison to Theodotus' and Rheginus' weakens the dating on the base of the virulence of the language.

[28] See *Exp. symb.*, PG77, 1325B, H.-J. Sieben, 'Zur Entwicklung der Konzilsidee' (1973), 29-32. See also G.L. Castro, *Cirillo di Alessandria: Epistole cristologiche* (1999), 114 commenting on Cyril's third letter to Nestorius, ACO I 1/1, 34, 14-8.

[29] Theodotus transfers to the current bishops the rank he attributes to the Old Testament prophets and priests (ACO I 1/2, 71, 30-2). The passages in which he states that not even they could help humanity (ACO I 1/2, 85, 12-5, 23-5) are part of the Christological polemic, and actually show that for Theodotus religious persons have great dignity. Likewise, by their spiritual authority, the bishops are entitled to, for example, dispute with secular rulers – just as prophets had done in scripture.

[30] *E.g.* 'our building', *Qērellos* 4.1, 130, 6.

Theodotus seems aware of a change of paradigm for bishops, adding to the role of preacher those of scholar, of compiler of *florilegia*.[31] Less emphasis is placed on pastoral concern as direct engagement with the faithful, than on the establishment of doctrine through the use of documents. He values the uprightness of theological teaching highly throughout his works. In the non-conciliar homilies there are references to the role of the preacher and to ecclesiastical figures of authority – although not clearly identified with bishops – who can tell what is 'right'.[32] This corresponds, even if in a guise not influenced by a conciliar surrounding, to the teaching role at the core of Homilies III and VI.

Authority was central in defending and spreading theological views. The preacher spoke from an eminent place, and usually carried also the heightened status of bishop. He would consider himself and his contemporaneous bishops authorities who stand on the shoulders of the church fathers. References to them and some citations from select works were gradually used as almost as normative yardsticks as excerpts from scripture, if not explicitly in theory, then at least in practice. Alongside the authority enjoyed by the speaker on account of his position and reputation, his rhetoric was key for him to defend and spread his theological views. The bishops had to be efficient communicators. Effectively employing what they had learnt of classical paideia and Christian exempla, they could avoid the internal contradictions and pitfalls of the views they would not give up. Already in late antiquity the opponents pointed out several logical problems and shortcomings in the theological views espoused by the different champions of Ephesus.[33] Instead of claiming that the thinkers[34] were unaware or unable to see the faults of their own views, the reciprocal criticism suggests they were not only aware of them, but understood them and reacted accordingly. Whenever possible, even the leading theologians of both camps avoided deepening the discussion, and kept arguments as much as possible restricted to their favourite grounds. They claimed to speak clearly and sufficiently, and did not branch out to make it more approachable from different perspectives. In homilies, weak logical arguments may have been deliberately explored for the visual richness of the paradoxes and jumps in logic they represented.[35]

[31] T. Graumann, *Die Kirche der Väter* (2002), 212-3.

[32] *E.g.* ACO I 1/2, 83, 37 - 84, 1, M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 226 II, 9 - III, 4.

[33] Some examples of traps in the Cyrillian Christology, attractive for its elegance and simplicity, which come up when analysed more carefully are delineated in the incisive, albeit partisan approach to Cyril of L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 135-6. See the reviews C. Kannengiesser, 'Review of *Nestorio e il concilio de Efeso*' (1978), G. Jouassard, 'Le cas de Nestorius' (1979).

[34] Like their audiences, most were familiar with classical philosophy and logical analysis, *e.g.* of the progymnasmata. See E.J. Watts, *City and School* (2006), 3-4.

[35] For example, Theodotus' Homily III, ACO I 1/2, 72, 12-3; Homily I, ACO I 1/2, 81, 34; Homily IV.4 (PG77, 1393D).

The efficaciousness of this approach relies on motives not pertaining to logic, but on rhetoric and on arguments of authority.[36]

In Homily III, Theodotus refers to the authority of the church to justify excision, when he uses general aspects of the medical simile alongside references to the scriptural and the historical roots of the church.[37] He highlights the tradition and the responsibility every bishop has: 'also the saints have taken care of this most sacred church'.[38] This increases the expectations and charge of the bishops. The succession is expressed genealogically[39] and firmly anchored in the past,[40] so that in the absence of any reference to the contrary, it amounts to ardently claiming that the priesthood of those bishops gathered for the session of 22 June goes back uninterruptedly to the apostles.[41]

The passages commending the authority of the church also seem to indicate that although many, the bishops were united in one single true faith. Based on scripture and the central role of Peter in receiving power and encumbrance from Christ, Theodotus dwells on the authority which the present church acquires by recognising and interpreting theology 'correctly'. Since there is only one faith, if the bishops have the same one Peter had, then they are entitled to the same authority he received from Christ.

Theodotus probably chose *Matt.* 16:13-20 not only for its Christological content,[42] but also because it supported the claims of the church, that by episcopal inheritance it had authoritative teaching. Especially the see of Rome laid claims to it, since Peter was its apostolic founder.[43] Whether the legates were present when Theodotus preached Homily VI, and understood his Greek or not, is not essential to consider how Theodotus wanted to persuade his audience, just as later readers, of the strength of the authority on which the council banked to decide and to enforce its decision, since the sentence against Nestorius had relied[44] on Celestine's letters.

The genealogical link to the apostles, and especially the defence of sound teaching were at the heart of the claims to authority by the council and its members. Just as an apostle or a see could be distinguished as excelling in the teachings it held,[45] so could also an individual bishop. Theodotus therefore encouraged the other bishops, who should in principle be following the correct

[36] Compare D. Krausmüller, 'Theotokos-diadochos' (2006), 37, 45.
[37] ACO I 1/2, 72, 4-5.
[38] ACO I 1/2, 71, 30-1.
[39] 'Fathers': *Qērellos* 4.1, 122, 7-9, 124, 14.
[40] ACO I 1/2, 71, 30.
[41] On 'the saints' and the relation to credal formulae, see also H. Kruse, '"Gemeinschaft der Heiligen"' (1993), 249-50, 254.
[42] *Qērellos* 4.1, 130.
[43] See also p. 46, 104.
[44] See p. 59.
[45] Praise of Ephesus: ACO I 1/2, 73, 19, 21.

teaching of the faith anyway, to acknowledge such leadership. This gave Theodotus the opportunity to exalt Cyril's status.

Leadership and teaching: Cyril

While Homily III gives some prominence to Cyril, reflecting the centrality of texts from his pen and his leadership at the session of 22 June, it is Homily VI, presumably first delivered after Cyril's and Memnon's deposition by the Orientals, and the arrival of news of courtly dissatisfaction with the Cyrillian Council,[46] which signals the rallying of the council in support of Cyril. He is the only leader acknowledged by Theodotus.[47]

The encomium of Cyril starts in the exordium: he is the 'precious stone' at the centre of the 'crown of fathers'.[48] This is developed, with the exegesis of *Matthew* 16, to the 'rock' on which the bishops are to be 'erected'.[49] The 'great grace of the lord' causes Cyril's preciousness:[50] by this Theodotus likely envisages Cyril's leadership and theological excellence, even superiority. So, too, does his coming to Ephesus, where his presence has led the bishops to and through the session of 22 June, and they hope that he will guide them in the ongoing fight and the upcoming struggles.[51]

Theodotus' description of Cyril as coming from Egypt allows him to intertwine the praise with Christological content, and thus to attack Cyril's enemies. A fleeting remark about Egypt in the past accentuates the importance of the present. The present, as the time of the Second Adam,[52] has as former time the age of the Old Testament, when Egypt was the land of Israel's enslavement; God's people left it guided by Moses, the archetype of episcopal praise.[53] The present, as the time of Theodotus and the Council of Ephesus, is preceded by a time when in Egypt there was paganism and Christian heresies flourished, but Cyril has curbed them. In both senses of present time, the Egypt of the past could not give Christianity a gift such as Cyril's theology. Theodotus considers the possibility of apprehending the divine mysteries a gift. For example, in Homily I, the presents of the magi are also gifts, which by their (traditional) meaning (of kingship, divinity and suffering) help to guide the understanding of Christology.[54]

[46] See pp. 95ff.

[47] Theodotus' praise lavished on Memnon (ACO I 1/2, 73, 19-22.) is less effusive or consequential than the exaltation of Cyril.

[48] *Qērellos* 4.1, 122, 9.

[49] *Qērellos* 4.1, 132, 1.

[50] *Qērellos* 4.1, 122, 10-1.

[51] *Qērellos* 4.1, 126, 1-5.

[52] Homily V.5, M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 228, 2-16.

[53] C. Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity* (2005), 128.

[54] ACO I 1/2, 83, an exegesis of *Matt.* 2:11.

To the cloudy former times Theodotus opposes the bright present. 'Egypt shines' more than 'the sun in the sky',[55] and as the sunlit sky brightens the earth, so does Egypt enlighten the Christian world. Probably, it was apparent to the audience that Theodotus meant at this particular moment Cyril himself, taking the place of origin for the person represented. Accordingly, Cyril is the sun that gives direction clearly. Furthermore, the clear sun demarcates the boundaries of light and shadows, like the church which by its synods and councils issues statements which gradually exclude wrong interpretations.

'Today it (*sc.* Egypt) has become heaven'[56] does not refer only to the present day, but to a longer understanding of the present, which encompasses the time since Christ's birth, and thus includes his sojourn in Egypt as well as the fifth century. Egypt had already become a bright place by its role in the life of Christ, and it gains an even greater importance with Cyril. To this end, as section 2 advances, in the opposition of past (first, then) and present (now, today), the notion of 'today' is narrowed to the years of the Nestorian controversy.

When Theodotus says that 'Egypt received the child',[57] he refers especially to Cyril taking voluntarily up the theological fight with Nestorius in the recent past. Also other Egyptian Christians, especially monks, had taken to heart things they read Nestorius had said, and had deemed them blasphemous. Their (over-) reaction had in Cyril's words prompted his involvement. Thus, the passage is also Theodotus' commendation of Cyril for having a diocese where the zeal for the faith is ripe.

Theodotus uses the framework of the flight into Egypt to discuss Christology, first by characterising Jesus as 'having become a fugitive for our sake'.[58] Since the intention is to exalt the teaching of Cyril, the exegesis weaves the praiseworthy elements of his Christology into the praise of the man, the immediate link being that Egypt plays a role both for Cyril and the biblical narrative. Theodotus describes the 'heretics' by their misunderstanding of the flight to Egypt: they 'despised his flight'.[59] With that expression, he counters the upsetting statements attributed to Nestorius,[60] since the reference highlights the childhood part of the saving incarnation. It also alludes to the themes of the lowness of Christ and of the 'mere man', which recur in Theodotus' and Cyrillian Christological works. Nestorius would have questioned what can be said about the subjects of the scriptural narrative, raising awareness that the child is

[55] *Qērellos* 4.1, 122, 14.
[56] *Qērellos* 4.1, 122, 13.
[57] *Qērellos* 4.1, 124, 3.
[58] *Qērellos* 4.1, 124, 4. In the context it primarily refers to the flight into Egypt, but it also echoes the characterisation of fallen humanity as 'fugitive' and 'runaway', which recurs in Homily III. See p. 144.
[59] *Qērellos* 4.1, 124, 2.
[60] See p. 73.

Christ, who is not identical to the λόγος.[61] Theodotus, however, addressed the event, and thus, without focusing on the (human or divine) status of the 'subject' of the flight, could say that 'the child [...] is the creator'.[62] Theodotus practically claims the angel[63] might just as well have said 'Rise, take up God and his mother', and that this must be understood as a valid interpretation of what is written in scripture.

A similar rhetorical tactic is found in Homily I,[64] where a typological exegesis of one of the miracles that happened in Egypt during the exodus of Israel binds together the themes of Egypt, Moses, travel and light to present a simile for the Christological mystery.[65] This passage from Homily I attests that Theodotus had other options to praise Cyril with the help of metonyms which involve Egypt.[66] For example, he could have picked up Mosaic parallels. The thematic choice of Jesus' flight was prompted by the relevance of Christ's infancy in the conciliar setting. Selectively mentioning that the 'child Jesus' 'fled', and 'has proven his humanhood' by this '(human) suffering' was a reaction to upsetting statements attributed to Nestorius about Christ as a baby and his childhood. Furthermore, Theodotus followed Cyril's line of argument[67] both to praise the patriarch and to repeat to all gathered bishops what was the orthodoxy they had to carry on defending.

The time of the events of the flight to Egypt becomes gradually the 'then',[68] to which, at the end of Homily VI.2, a 'today' is opposed: the time of Cyril's episcopal activity. This 'today' is bound to the 'then' related to Christ's corporality, childhood, meekness, also by Cyril's teaching, which the audience knew to dwell on these topics, mentioned frequently in previous phrases of section 2 and just summarised by this sentence, introduced by 'then'. At this point of the

[61] ACO I 1/2, 46, 5-10.

[62] *Qērellos* 4.1, 124, 3-4.

[63] *Matt.* 2:13.

[64] A passage possibly known by the audience of Homily VI, *cf.* p. 77.

[65] The key passage is: '[Tell me] how, in Egypt, light became darkness (*cf. Ex.*10:22), not having become extinct, but remaining what it was? For it was day for the Israelites and light surrounded them splendidly, but this light became darkness for the Egyptians, and what was seen, being one, was at once light and darkness, not having been quickly turned from this and becoming that.' ACO I 1/2, 84, 16-20.

[66] Egypt is not only a metonym for Cyril, but is portrayed as a factor for Cyril's orthodox leadership, as if he could draw some spiritual strength from a place which was venerated for scriptural narratives associated to it, even without 'material' evidence, for example, in the form of relics. In Late Antiquity this was but one of the *agentia* that could sanctify a place or a venue, yet one which gained increasing importance. See P. Gemeinhardt and K. Heyden (eds), *Heilige, Heiliges und Heiligkeit* (2012), 83. Theodotus suggests that Christ's bodily presence in Egypt had been enough to sanctify that space.

[67] For example, on Christ's (human) suffering, *Ep.* 1, 14 (ACO I 1/1, 16, 18-32). However, Cyril adopts the theme of Christ's infancy mostly after 22 June, *e.g. Ep.* 23 (ACO I 1/2, 66, 24-30).

[68] Explicitly stated in 'Then [...] when in body Jesus was there': *Qērellos* 4.1, 124, 10.

homily, the 'crown' has transcended any physical meaning it could have at the end of section 1, referring there to a 'choir of fathers' which can be read as the assembly of bishops. Before section 3, the crown is a symbol, possibly associable to apocalyptic, imperial contexts, used without precise reference, except that it is meant to represent something above. It allows Theodotus hyperbolically to equate Cyril and Christ as righteous teachers of faith. Cyril's merits and achievements are to be so highly regarded that he can stand for Christ. Also brightness and enlightening are mentioned at the end of both initial sections. The next one discusses the steadfastness of the church in the face of the challenge of heresies, that is, the danger of deviating from the faith. Theodotus prepares the theme by praising Cyril as one who is righteous, and therefore is correct and knows the non-deviating path of faith.

Theodotus commends Cyril's engagement in spreading his view of the faith, and attacking what disagrees with it. As one who 'teaches the faith' he 'enlightens the souls', 'with the saviour'.[69] Cyril is a model of the authoritative teacher, who has the correct teachings and knows how to convey them. A teacher would also correct and condemn mistakes. Allusions to teaching occur in Homily III too, after the medical topos.[70]

A teacher passes on what he knows and demands attention to his lessons. Theodotus takes up the role of the teacher, in which he has just placed Cyril, asking for attention from his audience to the narrative which follows,[71] leading to the exegesis of *Matt.* 16:13-20. There, Peter is the one who knows the correct answer. Theodotus expands the quotation from scripture so that he makes Jesus interpret Peter's answer loaded with Cyrillian Christological content.[72] In scripture, Peter is called blessed, and appointed as the 'rock', the 'foundation'. In Homily VI, Cyril is called blessed and rock by Jesus himself, because, as Theodotus puts it: 'Blessed are you [...] because [...] the mystery of the incarnation, truly, you recognised'.[73] Peter cannot give the whole answer, only the key elements which by proper exegesis can be expanded to the full 'right' answer. In the homily, Jesus does what Cyril has done. Theodotus portrays Jesus as saying what Cyril says. Exchanging their roles, Theodotus has taken further the image at the end of section 2, where Cyril is like Jesus, and does what he does.[74] Cyril

[69] *Qērellos* 4.1, 124, 11-3.
[70] See p. 129.
[71] *Qērellos* 4.1, 126, 5.
[72] For example, that Christ is the visible one and is called 'God λόγος', 'the one in the form of a servant' is called 'lord', *etc.* A good parallel passage in Cyril's works is *Scholia* 1 (ACO I 5/1, 220, 5-11), but, as discussed in H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 259, this work was probably written after the council, attenuating the anathemata. See p. 175 for parallels in Cyril's works prior to the council, especially in the letters *Coll. Vat.* 1, 2, 4.
[73] *Qērellos* 4.1, 128, 17ff.
[74] *Qērellos* 4.1, 124, 11ff.

has prepared with his teaching the Christians to hear the answer which even Peter would not have understood fully.

Theodotus' praise of Cyril goes further, in presenting him as the 'rock' in *Matthew* 16, albeit not explicitly. The rhetorical argument of Homily VI leads towards a multilayered reading of the 'rock'. For Theodotus, several things must be seen as firm foundations,[75] and the bishops must get their support from them:[76] the expanded version of Peter's answer, with all its Christology; the church itself, as an abstract entity in time and space, going back to Peter; its authority; Cyril's teaching; perhaps, the see of Rome and its representatives, having taken up Cyril's teaching. At the end, Theodotus has gone beyond the man. In any of these meanings, the Cyrillian Christology is the firm and great rock, as are also those who are ready to espouse, rely on and defend it. Probably Theodotus was preaching to men who held the title of bishops,[77] but the end of Homily VI[78] is directed only at those who can understand themselves as being addressed in (Theodotus' rendering of) Christ's words to Peter, that is, the Cyrillian bishops. Those who build the church are being encouraged to take up this teaching of the faith.

The praise of Cyril's teaching,[79] which argues for making him into a figure of authority is a great praise of the Alexandrian bishop. Cyril, by his teaching, leads Christians to salvation by righteousness,[80] that is, Cyril's righteousness. Having presented some key elements of Cyril's teaching of faith, Theodotus exhorts the bishops to support themselves on it.[81] Considering the circumstances in Ephesus,[82] it might have seemed unwise to preach to the bishops to erect their church on a man under attack from many fronts. Instead of supporting alternative or additional foundations, Theodotus insists it was important that Cyril's teachings were defended in the fight ahead of them, to which he is encouraging the bishops. If a literal reading of the end of Homily VI.1 is warranted, and Cyril was sitting right at the centre of the circle of bishops, we may imagine that he was not displeased to see his theology so ardently defended.

When battle is waged against heresy, the faith of each bishop matters. Even if it must agree with Cyril's teaching, Theodotus does not mention his name in this context.[83] The individual unwavering effort has contributed to the success of the battle so far: each bishop, not least while alone in his diocese, has done

[75] *Qērellos* 4.1, 128-30.
[76] Beginning of Homily VI.5, *Qērellos* 4.1, 128, 5ff.
[77] P. 94.
[78] *Qērellos* 4.1, 132.
[79] *Qērellos* 4.1, 124, 11-4.
[80] *Qērellos* 4.1, 124, 13.
[81] *Qērellos* 4.1, 132, 1ff.
[82] See pp. 81, 141.
[83] 'Much battle happened in the opposition to your (pl.) faith (ሃይማኖትክሙ), but no one wavered.' *Qērellos* 4.1, 124, 17.

his part and his efforts deserve recognition. Moreover, at the session of 22 June each bishop chose to approve Cyril's letter, and all of them have since not wavered in paying heed to his teaching of faith. If the church leads a battle against heresy, the bishops, fighters for Christ,[84] assembled for the council, are an army which stands firm behind the leadership of Cyril.

Homily VI, in praise of Cyril, is not simply a piece of propaganda for the bishop of Alexandria.[85] It places the teaching at the centre, and therefore advances statements representative of Cyrillian Christology. Theodotus presents, especially in sections 2 and 4,[86] what he saw as an 'orthodox' understanding of the faith. When delivering Homily VI, Theodotus – whether or not one of the master-minds behind the conciliar events, or a real ally of Cyril – puts into practice the advice he gives: he supports himself on Cyril's teaching and is ready to fight for the faith. As Cyril, Theodotus teaches anew the faith, so that his audience can be strengthened by it.

Theodotus has, in Homily VI, put Cyril's Christology at the centre of the authoritative teaching of the church, just as Cyril's letters had been used in the session of 22 June to portray what was in accordance with the Nicene creed. Theodotus' Homily VI exemplifies the reliance on a living authority, and is closely related to the search for guiding paradigmatic figures in the church, and to the problems of theologians becoming an authority themselves.[87] A living leader could provide an actual model for reference and identification, and could defend himself, however, he could also err.

Apparently, figures of authority were more highly regarded when the relation to them was not vague and general, or stemmed from a different cultural tradition.[88] There could not be a nearer and more precise source of authority than

[84] *Eph.* 6:10-7, for most parallels for the martial images.

[85] Texts which are not related to theological diatribes indicate that piety or orthodoxy were not as important as pastoral qualities like charity and philanthropy in the daily life of dioceses. See E. Wipszycka, *Études sur le christianisme dans l'Égypte* (1996), 149, J. Maxwell, 'Education, humility and choosing ideal bishops' (2011), 450-1, 461, B. Neil *et al.* (eds), *Preaching Poverty* (2009), 40-4, 219-20. The approach to poverty in Theodotus' Homily VI suggests the Cyrillian Council was indeed concerned with the theological question, and not only with the 'juridical' issue of deposing Nestorius, as reinforced by the contrast with positive references to poverty (*e.g.* ACO I 1/2, 87, 10f).

[86] *Qērellos* 4.1, 122-8.

[87] Preaching in praise of a bishop who is in the audience, and who has received a collective unanimous support (at least as far as those present are concerned, or most readers of the collection of documents where this homily is found) represents a step beyond the 'sich auf eine herausragende Einzelpersönlichkeit zu beziehen, sich an ihr zu orientieren und sich über den Rückgriff auf sie zu definieren', T. Graumann, 'Kirchliche Identität und bischöfliche Selbstinszenierung' (2003), 10.

[88] To an Egyptian audience, even Cyril needed to emphasise his links to the authority of Athanasius, and the claims of the Oriental bishops of following authoritative teachings were deemed convincing when they echoed this. *Ibid.*, 202, *id.*, *Die Kirche der Väter* (2002), 411. *Cf.* S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004), 210.

the bishop on whose letters a council had relied and who was at the centre of an ensuing liturgical celebration. However, a living figure of reference was always in danger of stepping out of the right faith. Moral, ethical, health and physical factors were important for the construction of reputation, yet the main issues related to the teaching on the faith. Also past authoritative figures could be reconsidered, and the church was drawing near to condemning deceased theologians once held in high esteem.[89] There were other reasons for the identification with a figure of authority not to be complete and servile. Cyril deliberately identified himself with Athanasius, and contributed to establish his status of fearless fighter for orthodoxy, but by keeping some distance, Cyril could gradually change and develop the aspects he was highlighting in Athanasius' theology, and also keep the identification with his predecessor only partial and temporary. Just as Cyril does not lose his own character and prominence when identifying himself with a figure of the past,[90] so the bishops in Ephesus, despite all their keen rallying behind Cyril do not become one with him. With a living figure of authority, even more distancing was justifiable. For example, in Homily VI, Theodotus does not say 'Cyril' when he says on what 'rock' the bishops should support themselves. The search for an authoritative teaching requires a person of authority, but goes beyond him.

References to a figure of authority usually also implied what was the teaching associated to him. Theodotus was perhaps aware that the Cyrillians, all claiming to be identifying themselves with Cyril, were not necessarily espousing the same ideas. Their attachment to a name (as exemplified by the votes at the session of 22 June), did not exclude the possibility of manifold views about his person and his theology. By only mentioning the name they exempted themselves from stating more theological details. As described above, Theodotus interweaves the praise of Cyril with theological topics which he presents as Cyril's teaching, and thus his discourse supposedly instructs his audience about what they had declared their agreement and support probably just a few days earlier.

At the end of Homily VI, Theodotus has developed a figure of authority with which only bishops are called to identify themselves. He has sketched a model of Cyril already meant only for the ears of bishops, far predating Cyril's tactics in his struggles to defend his authority after the Reunion of 433.[91] Theodotus achieves this new pattern of praise of Cyril at the moment of preaching to an audience not necessarily formed only of bishops. All who could hear his voice

[89] As exemplified by Theophilus' synodical letter (Jerome, *Ep.* 92), the works of deceased theologians were already being condemned, but not yet the authors. On Theophilus attacks on Origenism and contemporary 'condemnations' of Origen, see S. Elm, 'The dog that did not bark' (1998), 80-1.

[90] T. Graumann, 'Kirchliche Identität und bischöfliche Selbstinszenierung' (2003), 211.

[91] *Ibid.*, 212, claims that Cyril develops only after 433 a self-representation meant solely for an audience involved in dogmatic discourse, which is not the model or guide role for Christians in general.

in a church in Ephesus[92] formed a probably wider public than that of a letter addressed only to fellow bishops.

This last paragraph offers a caricatured reading of Homily VI, which, despite the extreme interpretations it contains, may inspire the reader to a fruitful critical reappraisal of the text. The sermon could be read as a desperate search for a figure of authority, when circumstances became more adverse; as delivered by a bishop on the verge of panicking, who imagined he was about to face excommunication just as Cyril, and who dreaded the displeasure of the court, which he anticipated in view of the actions of imperial officers, like Candidianus. Such a reading would be in line with a picture of Theodotus as an unoriginal thinker and a simple-minded bishop, representative of an hypothetical mediocre mass of bishops, out of which only extremely few are worthwhile considering. Accordingly, Rheginus' homily[93] could be simplistically interpreted as a celebration sprung from collective enthusiasm from bishops for whom the session of 22 June was a lightweight matter which would straightforwardly be acknowledged and accepted by the whole world.[94] Although this takes the ridicule too far, and disregards the rhetorical polish of late antique texts, especially of homilies in conciliar collections, the parody envisages that in Ephesus bishops at one point or another took to the pulpit, so to speak, and shouted frantically at their fellow bishops not to give up the fight and keep together. Christians, moved by the Spirit, could take liberties a classically trained orator would have to justify more carefully.

Coping with uncertainties

A few passages from the conciliar homilies give glimpses of Theodotus' views of his social and political surroundings. The sermons refer to the instability and changeability of worldly might and status. Also reflected in the rhetoric and in the relation to the audience are possible references to Theodotus' former friendship with Nestorius. Excesses of secular power, slavery and poverty, and religious violence are some of the less than ideal aspects of late antique society alluded to.

The remainder of this section discusses possibly farfetched secondary meanings of some passages to which Theodotus probably did not allude deliberately. Those who heard or read the sermons may well not have grasped the references. They are nevertheless clues to cultural and political background of the homilies, and thus for a world view shared by the bishops and their audiences.

The conciliar homily of Juvenal of Jerusalem evidences episcopal awareness of political uncertainties.[95] Similarities in content suggest that Theodotus had

[92] See p. 94.
[93] ACO I 1/2, 70-1.
[94] *Qērellos* 4.1, 39 tempers *ibid.*, 16-7.
[95] *Qērellos* 4.1, 35-6.

analogous concerns. In Homily VI.4, Theodotus interrupts his flow of argument to address the renegade (Nestorius) saying: 'become blessed and not condemned!'.[96] Juvenal says: 'He [Nestorius] will fall if he does not support himself on the power of the Spirit'.[97] Both authors place the condemnation in the future ('will fall', 'become condemned'), and state an alternative ('support in the power of the Spirit', 'become blessed'). Nestorius had already been condemned by the council and, for the bishops, their decision was an expression of the divine judgement. The future phrasing of the condemnation may indicate that what had been achieved was of smaller consequence compared to remaining and dying in error. It suggests that both authors expected a divine judgement to confirm the decision of the church in view of the life of the person, and some eschatological damnation for those who persisted in heresy.

The lasting final condemnation would be avoidable by a conversion while alive. Juvenal is harsher than Theodotus on the chances of this happening. Theodotus' 'become blessed' leaves the emphasis on the individual. Although the divine (especially through grace, or the presence of the Spirit) facilitates conversion, men can achieved it by holding to the faith, as taught by the fathers and the (orthodox) church, that is, what Theodotus is himself preaching. Juvenal, however, specifies the presence of the Spirit. It is perhaps a clearer formulation of Theodotus' expression, but it can also represent a shift of focus, since the 'power of the Spirit' is in and supports the church.[98] There is perhaps a small change to the sense. At least Juvenal's future condemnation cannot be (fully) identified with the council's, so as to avoid its logical conflict with occasional representations of Nestorius' condemnation as a fact which put him beyond such help.[99]

These interpretations of Juvenal's homily[100] correspond to discussions of his motivations and values based on the abundant information about his actions and deeds.[101] Juvenal avoided saying, at least in a situation where his words were being registered in written form, something which could be held against him should Antiochene Christology prevail, or could alienate the powerful see of Constantinople, should Nestorius be reinstated.[102] If such a complex reading

[96] *Qērellos* 4.1, 128, 16f.

[97] *Qērellos* 4.1, 83.

[98] See *Matt.* 12:32, *Rom.*15:19, *Matt.* 10:20, 1*Cor.* 2:4, *Eph.* 3:5.

[99] For example, *Qērellos* 4.1, 134-7; ACO I 1/2, 70, 19ff.

[100] '[T]heological differences [...] are said to have been sufficiently elucidated by the fathers. Although Nestorius had already been deposed by the conciliar majority, he [Juvenal] saw that the case was not yet closed, in view of the Antiochene and imperial opposition', *Qērellos* 4.1, 35-6.

[101] E. Honigmann, 'Juvenal of Jerusalem' (1950), R. MacMullen, *Voting about God* (2006), 45.

[102] This exemplifies commonplace questionable attempts of pointing out passages to corroborate biographical information about an author. Criticism of such analyses has found echoes, for example, in the works of Barthes and Derrida, where individual traits seem to have no role in the creative endeavour. Dismissing such strict theorisations, theologians and historians continue to

of a brief conventional passage is valid for Juvenal's homily (consistent with 'a case not yet closed') because one can consider his biography and many later events, the same can be done with Theodotus' text, which largely shares context and background.

Both authors employ harsh terms for the condemnation of heresies when characterising the interlocutor, instead of the honorific titles given to any bishop until condemned. The preaching bishops balanced this with the chance of (almost) any error being corrected (by God, by or through them, *etc.*). The ensuing contrast signals the possibility of a change of heart which coexists unexplained with claims of one faith, allied to one truth, which is ever-lasting, unchanging, and, according to the church, expressed by the conciliar statements. All bishops shared a certainty that their majority reached the right decision, whether at 'undisputed' councils, or at the sessions they had recently attended in Ephesus. For them, the faith did not change. Even if they were aware that previous generations expressed views which we now describe as different, they did not express this historically. They acknowledged the limitations of human understanding of divine matters, and nevertheless they trusted in the prerogative of the church to decide on matters of orthodoxy. The condemnation of Nestorius had been achieved on technical grounds of meeting Celestine's conditions, but for the Cyrillians these bore sufficiently on Nestorius' teachings.

As men dealing with power, *e.g.* planning conciliar sessions, Theodotus and Juvenal may have pondered on decisions being revoked under similar circumstances, even without the involvement of secular powers. Their preaching, however, echoed little the fickleness of history.

Facing error

Theodotus strives to ascertain the authority of the conciliar bishops and to praise those who teach the faith. However, he does not forget the human limitations to which they are also subject. He reminds them, lest they become over-confident or ambitious. They are close to some who err from the faith, and the teaching of the faith is very vulnerable to deviating from orthodoxy. Thus, when describing to them the human shortcomings that can distance mankind from God – in a passage that is essentially an ornate re-rendering of the narrative of the fall of mankind[103] – Theodotus may have implicitly referred to his (almost) being sidetracked by the friendship to Nestorius. In the aftermath of the session of 22 June, it echoed the dangers and errors in which they all

accept unquestioningly authorial echoes. The lack of biographical anecdotes about Theodotus makes it difficult to choose consistently among the possible inferences from the text, some of which are contradictory. Rather, the plausibility of the alternatives reveals the scope of late antique homiletics.

[103] ACO I 1/2, 72, 16-9. See the section on p. 155.

could fall, and his case may have been a compelling example: he had erred or been close to erring, yet he wanted the bishops to believe that he had distanced himself from Nestorius' error. He stated a *captatio benevolentiae* to validate his orthodoxy and thus the teaching in his preaching.

In a passage[104] agreeing with the soteriological emphasis behind most Christology prior to the Council of Ephesus and also employed during it,[105] where the most evident and main reading is that 'we' refers to fallen human nature, which needed the redemption through Christ (for *since* redemption could only be achieved by the incarnate God, Christology had to be understood correctly), the repetition of the first person plural, 'we', in emphatic positions of the sentences stresses the relevance of the issue for each and everyone more effectively than a technical discussion of the salvation which the incarnation brought about would, since presented as what already had happened, it would be less 'present'.

Referring back to the initial subject of the homily, the 'we' may have encompassed Christians who in recent times had 'erred' from the correct understanding on this relevant matter, even Theodotus. Considering Theodotus' statement at the session of 22 June about his friendship to Nestorius,[106] the 'we' may have been meant to be understood as an 'I', Theodotus speaking about himself.[107] Interpreting the passage as a *captatio benevolentiae* remains secondary. From Theodotus' homilies prior to the council it is clear that he already held an anti-Nestorian stance firmly, but this does not exclude that at some point he had defended Nestorian views. If accurate, the reports of his friendship to Nestorius may have affected his reputation, and there may have been slander or (even written evidence) that once it went beyond personal connections.[108] A never remorseful Theodotus would not refer to his acquaintance with Nestorius more than in the passage of contrition of Homily III alongside the acknowledgement of the friendship at the session.

'We' can also refer to all bishops, since, until they had clearly condemned Nestorius and his views, by coexisting with and thereby tolerating him in their midst, they had been 'distanced' from the one correct understanding of Christology. Confessing this, and trusting in God's mercy, they crave for forgiveness, which must be concomitant to avoiding the deviating view, and therefore the excerpt speaks for the acceptance of the conciliar decision. As for Nestorius, while he does not give up his heretical views, he must remain segregated.

Whether personal or collective, the passage echoes repentance, and stands as a *captatio benevolentiae* towards fellow bishops and God. By rekindling in a vivid portrait the state of fallen humanity, Theodotus presented to his audience

[104] ACO I 1/2, 73, 16-9.
[105] J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 175, D. Fairbairn, *Grace and Christology* (2003), 15.
[106] P. 63.
[107] 'My slowness': ACO I 1/2, 73, 22.
[108] See p. 63ff.

not only the background for the redeeming incarnation, but also the helpless state of heretics, worse than that of human beings before the start of the economy. The church in its pastoral duty ought to ascertain that Christians remain in the faith. The surge of heresy indicated its failure, and hinted at shortcomings of its members. The 'we' can thus refer to the clergy, especially the bishops in Theodotus' audience. The whole collective church is affected by the error of only one. No part of the 'we' can be allowed to remain in heresy and be counted among the 'we' for salvation to be granted to the 'we'.

The passage, possibly representing Theodotus' or the bishops' *captatio benevolentiae*, is followed by the reference to God's effort not to lose human beings.[109] The bishops are bound to prevent error and to bring those in error to recant, even a heretic like Nestorius. Theodotus' concern with current heresies is likewise apparent in the passages aimed at instructing how to repudiate the envy and the plot of the devil.[110]

Theodotus linked the present day need to preserve the purity of the church to the narrative of fall, redemption and eschatological salvation of every human being and of humanity.[111] The plurality of interpretative layers of the passages discussed in this section typifies the lack of rigid boundaries of theological disciplines – inventions of much later centuries – when theology is put into practice. Theodotus expressed in his sermons only some facets of his complex theological views, and if taken out of context they can seem contradictory or irreconcilable, as exemplified by the aforesaid analysis of Homily III.3.

Dealing with fighting and violence

Violence was as much part of late antique society as of the life of the church.[112] Not only was it endured, but it was fostered against the enemies of faith. Among the conciliar homilists, Rheginus was the most explicit, wishing for Nestorius an end worse than that of Arius.[113] This section discusses passages where Theodotus may have had recent events or the ordinariness of violence[114] in mind, or which could be understood by the audience as more or less veiled allusions to it.

'The billows of unbelief [...] could not shake us'[115] is as much a reference to the debate of the last couple of years (which the bishops are keen to place in

[109] ACO I 1/2, 72, 22-3. Echoing 'good shepherd', *John* 10:12.
[110] ACO I 1/2, 72, 23-4, *Qērellos* 4.1, 130, 12ff.
[111] ACO I 1/2, 72, 3-9.
[112] Exemplified in Theodotus' festal homilies, where he contrasts Christ's meekness to the awe inspiring power of kings, which may hint that the distant imperial court, and especially the not so distant imperial army were dreaded. See Homily I, ACO I 1/2, 85, 30, 86, 4ff.
[113] ACO I 1/2, 71, 4-9. See p. 76.
[114] N.B. McLynn, *Christian Politics* (2009) II, 15ff.
[115] *Qērellos* 4.1, 124, 16.

the much longer fight against any heresy) as to the challenges to the Cyrillian Council. Further, Theodotus' claims that 'no one wavered' refer chiefly to the bishops of the Cyrillian Council. On the face of it, it should apply only to those who did not object to and attended the session of 22 June. Theodotus pays no heed to waverers who, for example, signed the protest on 21 June and changed their minds soon after,[116] and especially none to those who joined the Cyrillian Council only after the first session. Since the purpose was to encourage the bishops to follow the lead of the praiseworthy Cyril and to speak in favour of the unity of the church, exceptions to unanimity had no place in a short homily, on account of form and length, and of content. Politeness towards the few who had wavered dictated silence on the matter. Praise of unwavering bishops was only needed because not all had been thus.

Theodotus' intention was to fortify the unity of the Cyrillians, by reminding them that their strength came from their faith. He praised Cyril for his teaching and expounded the faith, using biblical and patristic references that are as typical of homiletics, as of Cyrillian argumentation for validation. Theodotus instructed the bishops in his audience, so that they could understand their position of authority and the responsibilities it entailed, and followed Cyril's leadership.

Echoing the events of the preceding days, the sentence 'No one is wounded'[117] reflects a bloodless battle; and the exhortation to 'fight [...] for the sake of justice'[118] expects bloodless battles that lead to the 'renegade' becoming 'blessed'.[119] A bloodless battle applies especially well for a battle of words and letters, akin to what Cyril and Nestorius had exchanged.[120] In their letters, they expounded several antagonistic theological views, and the council had unanimously voiced approval of Cyril's letter, and likewise rejected Nestorius'. According to Theodotus' presentation of the 'unwavering' bishops, none of them had been tempted to adapt the understanding of Cyril's position, far less to adopt opposing views. Resoluteness is incompatible with dialogue, so it seemed preferable to abstain from discussion. Any opposition to Cyril's faith, once established as orthodox, had to be repudiated by all means. Thus, the passage can refer not only to the theological level of the dispute, but also to concrete events which had happened in Ephesus. The bishops were aware of Candidianus' displeasure,[121] and some of them may have wondered what the reaction of the court would be. Bodily injuries could be feared from measures taken by the

[116] See p. 47. Relatable to the editorial project to represent all sets of Cyrillian bishops as 'the Council', *cf.* T. Graumann, 'Protokollierung, Aktenerstellung' (2010), 18.

[117] Homily VI.3, *Qērellos* 4.1, 126, 1.

[118] *Qērellos* 4.1, 132, 3.

[119] Homily VI.4, *Qērellos* 4.1, 128, 16.

[120] N.B. McLynn, *Christian Politics* (2009) II, 37.

[121] *E.g.* ACO I 4, 32, 7.

secular government, or by forces which were allied to the opposing religious faction. The complaints of the delegations sent to Nestorius refer to such hazards.[122]

Theodotus hints that the powerful leadership of Cyril and Memnon,[123] well provided with physical forces, would allow the bishops to remain unharmed, especially if they were cohesive. It is assumed that a fair number of *parabalani* had escorted Cyril, and some may have been in Theodotus' audience.[124] Similarly, the citation of *Jer.* 1:10 in Homily III.1 could have, within the context of defending the deposition of Nestorius, a materiality with which to sanction even physical violence, such as was perpetrated under the orders of bishops, whether by the personal body guards under their command or by Christians following their exhortations. Theodotus refers to the context of real religious violence familiar to most bishops.

In Homily VI.3, 'arrows [which] were released' may allude to the sentence of deposition of Cyril and Memnon by the Oriental Council. The ensuing 'no one is wounded' is not incompatible with it, since no party was willing to recognise the occurrence of any council other than their own. The Cyrillians ignored the Oriental's decisions as much as possible, and Cyril continued to lead them for several weeks.[125] Accordingly, Theodotus claimed that a decision of those who stood in 'unbelief' did not wound.

Finally, a reader of the written version could even see in the 'arrows were released' a reference to the imperial *sacra* deposing Cyril, since it was ineffective in the long term, not least by the continued Cyrillian support. With hindsight, Theodotus' words could not have been truer, since none of the bishops who did not waver from the support of Cyril and his views was in the long term wounded within his lifetime.

Encomiastic and didactic aspects of the homilies

Bearing the relation of the homilies to the council in mind, it is worthwhile expanding the remarks of earlier sections about homiletics.[126] Although homilies are often placed in a rhetorical genre of their own, the relation to the three *genera dicendi* of classical rhetoric, still widely known and formally learnt by

[122] See p. 82.

[123] 'Memnon was himself a controversial character, the subject of complaints by his own bishops at the Council of Ephesus in 431, the charges including the use of force to make them support himself and Cyril of Alexandria in the dispute with Nestorius.' P. Norton, *Episcopal Elections* (2007), 224.

[124] Theodotus may have preached Homily VI referring to one specific event, perhaps remarkable at the moment, but which cannot be identified in the extant sources. The available documents allow enough conjectural readings that imaginative ones need not be added.

[125] See p. 81f.

[126] See pp. 35ff., and especially pp. 98ff.

many of the fifth-century preachers and their audience, must be taken into account.[127] It sheds light on the purpose of these texts and how the audience interpreted them.

Elements of the epideictic genre are obvious and span passages of invective and encomium, such as praise of Cyril and attacks on heretics and on Nestorius. They disallow the use of most contemporary characterisations of sermonising and the simplistic use of sharp boundaries of rhetorical genres since the epideictic content contributes to the didactic and forensic message of the texts. It cannot be assumed that because preacher and his audience shared most values[128] the homilies were always mainly contained, indeed developed within the epideictic genre, and the didactic aspect was negligible.[129] It is not a fair representation of the second sophistic to claim that 'from being the practical teaching of a life-skill' it had become 'a skill value only in itself',[130] so that any text would be mainly epideictic, understood as a metalinguistic praise of the text for itself ('rhetorical displays'[131]).

Epideictic texts can 'effect some change in the audience's understanding of the subject',[132] but their aim is not to influence action. They represent and reinforce values, using arguments and proofs, common to other genres, to persuade, but mainly praise and criticise individuals.[133] Therefore, even if a text is built mostly of passages of praise and blame, if its aim is to effect a change or plead a case, it ought not to be classified as epideictic.[134]

As already discussed,[135] both Homilies III and VI praise the gathered bishops, and concentrate on Cyril of Alexandria as the leading figure in thought and action. Theodotus identifies him as the individual driving force which gathers and guides the other bishops. Nevertheless, each bishop is also meant, and lauded with elaborate references to episcopal title and the biblical background.

[127] See P. Gemeinhardt, *Das lateinische Christentum und die antike pagane Bildung* (2007), 45.

[128] The cultural sharing is clearer in Christian texts, *e.g.* by the peculiarities of vocabulary.

[129] A. Stewart-Sykes, *From Prophecy to Preaching* (2001), 37-8. Since preaching would be a 'repetition of formulae intended not to impart new information or to alter behaviour, but to reinforce the convictions of the assembly, [... it] is to be understood as epideictic, which re-inforces the opinions of an audience, rather than changing them'.

[130] *Cf. ibid.*, 70-2, who criticises the decline narrative inherent to an analysis as by H.I. Marrou, *A History of Education* (1956), but not its content.

[131] *Cf.* A. Stewart-Sykes, *From Prophecy to Preaching* (2001), 38, who claims that a high preaching style antedates the more grandiose post-Constantine churches.

[132] R. Webb, 'Praise and persuasion' (2003), 127, M. Whitby (ed.), *The Propaganda of Power* (1998).

[133] See L. Pernot, *La rhétorique de l'éloge* (1993), especially pp. 659-724 for the use of argumentation and *ibid.*, 720-2, G. A. Kennedy, *A New History of Classical Rhetoric* (1994), 61-2 for the ultimate aims of an epideictic text. See also R. Webb, 'Praise and persuasion' (2003), 127.

[134] See pp. 151ff.

[135] See pp. 134ff.

The commendation of Cyril in Homily VI tries to persuade the audience to support a man who may be facing, or is about to face, adverse circumstances, and to build the strength of the council from there. Other homilies available only in Ethiopic collections are likewise exaggerated praises of Cyril and caricaturing attacks of heretics, including Nestorius.[136] Elements of the epideictic genre are present, since Cyril's Christology is the cause of his renown, but the praise of Cyril is not an end in itself in Theodotus' homily. The communication model is especially complicated. From the typical structure with sender, message and receiver, a present *laudandus* is at once part of the message and its receiver.[137] A concomitant praise of Cyril and of the council makes the sender also part of the message, and encourages an identification between the different receivers.

The praise of Cyril goes beyond its primary object of commendation of his leadership, and points to Cyril as a model and an authority. Both notions are employed with pedagogical aims. A model could be imitated or surpassed to achieve similar or greater excellence. An authority could be relied and built on. The presence of Cyril[138] would make a dialectic teaching environment possible – in theory, at least.

The conclusion of Homily VI[139] is an exhortation directed to all bishops, built on the praise of one among them, and is in line with the whole sermon, made of parts which can be described as epideictic but with the aim of encouraging a course of action.

Theodotus' Homily III is to a large extent a celebration of the council, and serves, at least in the collections, as a counterpart to documents like Rheginus' homily which is a *psogos* of explicit hate.[140] Apart from the evident links to the epideictic genre related to the council, at the end of Homily III occurs another instance of praise:[141]

> John, he imposed for us as teacher, the son of the thunder, he who conferred to this metropolis the common treasure of the world, he who in one single verse has expressed all the piety.

The mention of John may echo the setting suggested in the rubric, which states that the sermon was given in the church dedicated to John the Evangelist.[142] The praise is not restricted to the church building, but envisages the city as a whole in its claims to metropolitan status and importance. Should a larger audience

[136] Especially Acacius', Firmus', Rheginus' and Eusebius' sermons: respectively, *Qērellos* 4.1, 68-81, 134-7, 100-7, 118-21.
[137] C. Ronning, 'Rituale der Rhetorik – Rhetorik der Rituale' (2003), 113.
[138] *E.g.* 'in the midst', *Qērellos* 4.1, 122, 9.
[139] *Qērellos* 4.1, 132.
[140] See p. 129.
[141] ACO I 1/2, 73, 19-21.
[142] See p. 96 how the rubric may have taken this information from here.

have been present and have included local citizens,[143] presumably local aristocrats would have been among them, and the 'treasure of the world' may have appealed to them, pleased by the mention of their wealth, and the signs thereof which they displayed. However, from content and liturgical setting, 'metropolis' means primarily the episcopal see. As such, it is a benevolent gesture towards Memnon.[144] The importance of the see of Ephesus largely relied on the location of the tomb of St John, reflecting the late antique Christian view about the sanctifying presence of relics. However, the links of a place to events in the life or death of a saint were also valued, and Theodotus explored the connection of Ephesus with the writing of John's gospel.

The meaning of the passage goes beyond these mundane interpretations. What started as a hagiographical commonplace ('teacher', 'son of thunder') is brought into context when clarifying the desired meaning of the 'treasure' (κειμήλιον). 'Common treasure of the (inhabited) world (οἰκουμένη)' is not expanded to a praise of worldly achievements, but refined to what can indeed gratify,[145] that is, God made man. By praising John's achievement of formulating ('expressed') the redeeming event, Theodotus is indirectly commending the city which is related to him, for being hospitable to the bishops and for having hosted an event (the conciliar session) which has brought Christianity again close to the redeeming path, by removing error and upholding a formula of faith. Its citizens are to be the first to welcome and adhere to this decision.

Finally, Theodotus praises John's teaching for expressing the faith succinctly ('one single verse'). In line with the criticism of verbosity and wordy reasoning,[146] Theodotus commends this manner of speaking that adheres to succinct formulations to grasp the incarnation and other theological mysteries. The conciliar session,[147] and therefore its outcome, was in line with such rhetoric of brevity. Memnon as well as Ephesus had their share in the success to deserve this praise, which, however, is not construed as a particular commendation of Memnon's teaching and/or orthodoxy. Theodotus reserves such distinction for Cyril.

This brief panegyric passage at the end of Homily III interrupts the Christological theme, yet a recapitulation follows. The reference to St John as teacher, points back to the interconnected use of similes (doctor, husbandman, teacher) at the beginning, and thus to the importance of authoritative teaching. With support of a passage of John's gospel, Theodotus can reiterate points of the

[143] See p. 76 for possible popular involvement. They would have been kept informed by letters, rumours, and what they heard in church.

[144] It may even suggest that Theodotus lodged in Memnon's, just as Cyril is known to have done.

[145] ACO I 1/2, 73, 20: χαρίζω: 'confer', gratify, *etc.* For the theological background, p. 175.

[146] See p. 181ff.

[147] The proceedings were centred around the Nicene creed, selected texts and excerpts, and brief statements.

Christology he defends and had expounded in the homily. The final phrase encapsulates the incarnation that happened for the sake of human redemption, the balance of being and becoming, the economy as a central multilayered concept, and finally, the reference to φύσις without any qualificative. Since the homily initially seemed a panegyric of Cyril, Theodotus can in this brief concise and precise statement[148] pass his teaching as being Cyril's.

Theodotus construed a praise of Cyril in sentences and passages which frequently have additional meanings, and often refer to scripture. The auxiliary layers of meaning are far less important than the praise of Cyril, and probably were only noticed in Ephesus if Theodotus' delivery emphasised any of them by voice or gesture. They are connotations which, even if not driving Theodotus' choice of images and arguments, may have been among the reasons for him to know and remember them, or which could later come to the mind of readers. Thus, 'Your crown is this choir of the fathers'[149] suggests that Cyril is the crown for the bishops who are like the saints placed around Christ.[150] Cyril by, or with, the grace of the lord not only takes his place at their centre, but also has performed the deeds of Christ's life on earth, like the coming (back) from Egypt, and is willing to do all other things which followed the return from Egypt, up to the death on the cross.

In the previous sections were highlighted the effective persuasive character of the epideictic passages[151] by digressing on their content and their aim within the homilies. As discussed in the final sections, although most of the theological content of the sermons agrees with what was acclaimed positively at the 22 June session, Theodotus does not step back from saying details which seem dissonant of the views the conciliar bishops were likely to associate to Cyril,[152] and in his audience many who had joined the approval may not have been convinced about all Cyrillian theological details. Theodotus, as preacher, expresses his view on theology, ecclesiology, politics, so as to inform his audience about the correct approach to faith. Furthermore, the praise centres not on individuals, but on the uprightness of the teaching. Taken together, these aspects suggest the homilies, as spoken sermons, were mainly didactic.

[148] ACO I 1/2, 73, 20-4.

[149] *Qērellos* 4.1, 122, 9.

[150] *Rev.* 4:4.

[151] C. Ronning, 'Rituale der Rhetorik – Rhetorik der Rituale' (2003), 113-4.

[152] The works safely attributed to Theodotus provide at best a snapshot from the time of the Council of Ephesus and immediately before, while Cyril's vast output offers insights into his thought over time and different audiences. For example, the above mentioned conclusion of Homily III (ACO I 1/2, 73, 18-24) shows Theodotus' use of a vocabulary that alludes more pointedly to only divine nature than, for example, Cyril's Homily V, ACO I 1/2, 92, 32-3 and 93, 17-9, and, likewise, the warnings against human reasoning on divine matters are more absolute in Theodotus' Homily VI, *Qērellos* 4.1, 130, 10, than in Cyril's Homily I, ACO I 1/2, 96, 10-2, which abates his earlier statement in Homily V, ACO I 1/2, 94, 18-20.

Theodotus defended the actions of the council originally to encourage the bishops. In the conciliar collections, the homilies pleaded a case for the Cyrillian Council at the court and later generations. Theodotus, as author of the documents in the conciliar collection, is thus also defending the Cyrillian Council. The theological content is a piece of evidence justifying the need of a council. The encomiastic content defends the characters involved. The written text is therefore primarily deliberative.

Christology

In the sermons in Ephesus, Theodotus spoke mostly about Christology. Discussing first his stance on what was the central theological issue at the council will provide firmer ground to approach the other main topics, namely, ecclesiology and soteriology, which he closely linked to Christology, either springing from or leading to it. An analysis of Theodotus' theology depends on his sermons and treatises. These texts do not set out systematically his doctrinal views, but are shaped by the tensions deeply rooted in the controversies addressed. For the conciliar homilies in particular the discussions and events at Ephesus, between parties and within groups, provide the backdrop of the approach to and selection of theological questions. Therefore, the task at hand is not a systematic and comprehensive portrayal of Theodotus' theology. In the homilies, it unfolds in polemical fashion, remaining fragmentary.

Theodotus' audience spoke about itself as harmonious, but could hardly be unaffected by the disquiet around them, involving imperial officials, and implicitly referring back to the emperor who had invited them. The audience may have been aware there was variance in their theological views. Nevertheless, in line with the didactic paradigm of homilies, Theodotus provides arguments, often preemptive, to support the ideas he claims his audience shares with him, and which he presents as the only 'right' ones. Actually, the conciliar homilies contain hints of varying approaches to Cyril's Christology. Theodotus places all theological topics within a framework he claims to share with other fathers past and present,[153] but of which he expounds only few points.

The extremely selective presentation of only few theological themes in just two sermons first given in Ephesus justifies resorting also to the homilies originally delivered earlier but read at the council, as well as to passages from those few other sermons of certain authorship, so as to better present the overall shape of Theodotus' theological views. This seems legitimate, considering the earlier assessment that his stance remained fundamentally unchanged between

[153] This fabric allowed disputed theological themes to be conveyed among content widely accepted and cherished by an audience, including regional apocryphal narratives and cults. These references could help a preacher to gain popularity, more than by opposing them. See p. 28, and M.B. Cunningham, 'Preaching and the community' (1990), 35.

the run-up to the council and its immediate aftermath.[154] At the same time, it corroborates the insight into his consistency in demonstrating direct parallels between homilies and also how features in different sermons tailor seamlessly with each other.

For our understanding of Theodotus' theology, an overview of the different approaches and emphases in the main theological discussions of the time may be beneficial. The hypothetical links of Theodotus' youth and education to Antioch are not reflected in his Christology, which bears more resemblance to 'Alexandrian' formulations.[155] On the one hand, an Antiochene theologian[156] was usually concerned with showing that despite the centrality of there being two natures in Christ (which was already obvious from the language he was using), he upheld the unity of the person of Christ. On the other, 'Alexandrians', who valued the unity of Christ so highly that they were loath to choose – even to use – words to describe the humanity and deity in Christ, were keen to defend themselves in making clear that both, divinity and humanhood, are present in Christ, without mingling (especially without mingling the divine with what is intrinsic to the human), but cannot in any way be predicated of God.[157] The Antiochene approach placed prime importance in starting from scripture and figuring out how to understand it.[158] Therefore, the Cyrillian theologians had not only to use scripture in the central way seen in any Christian writer, but claim and show that their views were just as well grounded in scripture as the Antiochenes'.

The theology of Cyril was principally a narrative of God's saving activity and was expressed as such, a narrative which starts on high, then involves and is characterised by a coming down.[159] Therefore, a constant concern is how this does not affect what is understood of God. The narrative attempts to safeguard

[154] P. 110ff.

[155] This overview echoes N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 359-62, F. Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire* (2006), 149-161, S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004), 251-74, and relies on my recollections from A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben* (1979) and A. Grillmeier and T. Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben* (1990), 605-36, 652-61, 673-87, J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 126-226, L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 70-9, 110-31, T.G. Weinandy and D.A. Keating (eds), *The Theology of St. Cyril* (2003), 23-74, F.M. Young, 'A reconsideration of Alexandrian Christology' (1971).

[156] The traditional link to the city is only used for the lack of less controversial labels. Antioch did not represent a well defined theological tradition, and did not have a local hegemony akin to Alexandria, perhaps because more affected by the schisms of the fourth century, see P. Norton, *Episcopal Elections* (2007), 172. For the theological influence on Alexandria and the political-ecclesiastical importance in the wake of Constantinople 381 see C.A. Beeley, 'Cyril of Alexandria and Gregory Nazianzen' (2009), 418. A clear demarcation of theological schools is largely due to the choice of authoritative church fathers by religious groups which gained form by the polarisation and eventual schism which were unforeseen consequences of Ephesus I, and were not yet present before 430; see R. MacMullen, *Voting about God* (2006), 107.

[157] A. Grillmeier and T. Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben* (1990), 647, 679-82.

[158] J. J. O'Keefe, '"A letter that killeth"' (2000), 85.

[159] D.A. Keating, *The Appropriation of Divine Life* (2004), 191-201.

God from suffering. The coming down is expressed by God's acting and doing: he makes his own a 'something'. What this something is, is not always clearly expressed, and definitely never consistently by the same concept or word; sometimes it may be or seems to be 'humanity'.[160] This lexical imprecision does not affect the narrative, since it focuses on the downward movement. The Son takes on another form of existence, but is the same pre-eternal and the same uncreated being. Much emphasis is laid on the one and the same action, and the one and the same subject, yet there are different operations, for example, those of the Son as Christ, qualified by the incarnation. Cyrillians have then to elucidate how the incarnated one is different from the pre-existing one, that is, what the λόγος was before, and they dwell on what the λόγος was not before. To express how the form of the incarnated one is different from the pre-existing λόγος they speak of 'making its own', and they raise the caveat that there is no mingling.[161] The incarnated is a different *form* of the divine, without being a different entity. In this way, all actions come from one centre of activity (= God), and this directional sense is behind all texts.

In short, from the perspective of the language employed by each side, they saw problems in the more extreme opposite formulations: for the Antiochenes, the Cyrillian ways of speaking were absurd at moments; for the Cyrillians, the Orientals did what they would 'never' do.

Theodotus does not give his audience a lecture about Christology. Rather, he places topics on Christology within a narrative framework of the economy. He offers excerpts of this narration that are adequate to the context, for instance, of interpreting a scriptural passage. It is possible to piece together enough elements to see how in his theology all the events from creation – especially from the fall – until salvation are bound to the incarnation and life of Christ. It would be difficult to present the Christological material clearly without this framework, and keeping to it nonetheless allows a detached analysis of what characterises Theodotus' approach.

With 'rejoice, that you see Christ glorified!'[162] Theodotus expresses that the main achievement of the Council of Ephesus was the defence of a Christology that preserved fittingly what is due to him who saved humanity. Nevertheless, in Theodotus' works predominate passages on Christ assuming what is low in mankind.[163] He presents his Christology describing how God the Son moves in the world, as Christ, within the poor and low qualities of man, while sharing the glory of God.[164] Christ was 'glorified', revealing his glory, when he was

[160] 'Humanity' is expressed by an array of expressions related to τὰ ἀνθρώπινα, *cf.* M. Simonetti, 'Alcune osservazioni sul monofisismo di Cirillo' (1982), 503.

[161] J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 187.

[162] *Qērellos* 4.1, 122, 8.

[163] ACO I 1/2, 72, 24ff., *Qērellos* 4.1, 130, 1.

[164] ACO I 1/2, 83, 36.

resurrected and ascended into heaven,[165] but only who has the faith can stand in relation with him.[166] Also, insofar as 'see Christ glorified' has perhaps near-mystical connotations for Theodotus and his audience, the bishops who fight for orthodoxy have ample reason to rejoice, because they stay in that relation.

For Theodotus, the sufferings of Christ – such as his childhood, poverty, outrages – are not to be underrated[167] because Jesus truly experienced them so as to prove his complete humanity. This Theodotus considered indispensable for the salvation of humanity: 'he has become a human being for your sake',[168] or, more clearly 'the outrage has generated glory for you'.[169] Theodotus does not spell out in his homilies that by assuming 'all these that are[170] of the form of the slave', which are what impedes the salvation of human beings, the deity destroys them, as can be found, for example, in the conciliar sermon of Acacius of Melitene.[171] Perhaps, he had a rather singular interpretation of the causation of the incarnation. However, the conclusion, that salvation is brought about, is the same.

Humanity after the fall

Homily III presents a short narrative of the fall,[172] and as in other homilies Theodotus represents the sorrowful and helpless state of humanity after the fall by focusing on the insufficiency of any means apart from the incarnation to reverse this state.[173] In the Old Testament there may be examples of divine intervention, and the miraculous (which for Theodotus has an essential role in the economy) is prefigured, but it is not enough. Elements of that Old Testament characterisation still apply for human beings in the present day. It is not a derogatory view of humanity, it rather serves to emphasise its negative aspects, so as to build the background for the θαυμαστόν and παράδοξον of the incarnation.[174]

When describing the fall, Theodotus does not fail to mention the deceiving role of the snake, motivated by envy.[175] However, human beings hold greater responsibility, as described in Homily III.3. There, while he recalls the fall, as narrated in Genesis, Theodotus highlights the fallen nature of each individual by

[165] ACO I 1/2, 76, 32-3.

[166] *Qērellos* 4.1, 130, M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 231, 35-43.

[167] *Qērellos* 4.1, 124, 8.

[168] *Qērellos* 4.1, 124, 7.

[169] ACO I 1/2, 72, 12-4, *cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 306ff.

[170] The context implies that 'these' are the traits of human beings, but Acacius probably deliberately did not specify them as being those of humankind, humanity, of person, of man.

[171] ACO I 1/2, 91, 19-21.

[172] ACO I 1/2, 72, 16-21.

[173] ACO I 1/2, 85, 11ff., *cf. ibid.*, 570.

[174] *Cf. ibid.*, 398.

[175] *Qērellos* 4.1, 130, 13ff, ACO I 1/2, 72, 23.

the use of the second person singular, *e.g.* 'He took up what is yours (τὰ σά), since you (σύ) had abandoned what is his'. It affected all of mankind, wherefore Theodotus also employs the plural pronouns, *e.g.* 'We did not bear the grace that was being given by the lord'. 'We' refers to all human beings, within a narration of the salvation history, which is steadily built with a directional sense, and where the centre of activity is the same, all the time: God and his project.[176]

Theodotus describes more than once the helplessness of post-fall humanity to lift itself. The freedom of choice[177] associated with unnatural (ἀτόπου) desires[178] hinders all attempts to change the situation. His view about the state of humanity between the fall and the coming of the second Adam, expressed as hopeless and captive, also echoes Paul.[179] Theodotus explores the theme at length towards the end of Homily I: God, to save human nature, did it 'through his own [...] because (ἐπειδή) all creation was weak with regard to our salvation, who have the habit of both evil and of error'.[180] Here, 'because' has a causative and not explanatory meaning.

Another tension characteristic of Theodotus' understanding of humanity is that he speaks of the universal aspect of the salvation brought about by Christ's life at the same time that he represents current mankind still characterised by the attributes of humanity after the fall.[181] Theodotus predicates them to every human being including those in the present. In Homily III.3, the rhythmical pattern of the sentences and the persistent use of the first person plural place each noun (runaway, captive) and adjective (hopeless, slowness) in the same context regardless of the temporal reference.[182] The urgency to bring the descriptions of human beings between fall and incarnation to the present reflects Theodotus' description of heresy as another 'plot of the devil',[183] as if history threatened to repeat itself, and salvation, to be brought to nil.[184]

[176] *Cf. ibid.*, 411.

[177] Explicit and exquisitely praised in Homily I, ACO I 1/2, 85, 20-3.

[178] See Homily I, ACO I 1/2, 89, 10-5. The logic of the passage leaves open who made or moulded the 'unnatural desires', since they are described as prior to the fall. Theodotus does not discuss how the snake could find fertile ground for its suggestions, neither if or how such 'unnatural', 'unwanted' desires were actually shared by the λόγος, the only-begotten.

[179] ACO I 1/2, 72, 20-1. *Cf. Romans* 4.

[180] ACO I 1/2, 85, 12-3.

[181] See below, pp. 196ff., on Theodotus' universal orthodoxy as a *sine qua non* condition for universal salvation, interrelated with the rhetoric against heresy and demonic influence on earth. On the correlation of the topics in Gregory of Nyssa, and universal salvation as a corollary or distortion of concepts that can be linked to Origen's universalism, see M. Ludlow, 'Demons, Evil, and Liminality' (2012), 184, 210-1.

[182] *Cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 91, S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004), 212.

[183] *Qērellos* 4.1, 122, 5. *Cf.* M. Willing, *Eusebius von Cäsarea als Häreseograph* (2008), 443-5.

[184] ACO I 1/2, 72, 24, *cf.* N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 130.

Incarnation

Antithetical parallelisms came in handy to represent linguistically the descent of God which brings about the lifting of human nature. Theodotus does not express the paradox of the incarnation in one phrase, but in two antithetical statements, one emphasising the human, and the other, the divine, whose joint signification convey the desired general meaning. For example:

He remained God according to his nature, he became what you are on account of his philanthropy for you.[185]

Apparently, this sufficed for Theodotus, who did not discuss (further) the relation of being God and being human in the same one, Christ. Theodotus was not worried about an ontological explanation of the relation of the two natures in Christ.[186]

To convey clearly that humanity is saved through Jesus Christ, and that this was the purpose of the incarnation, Theodotus repeated that events related to the incarnation happened 'for our sake'.[187] In spoken discourse, the repetition of short sentences effectively bound the text together, and drew attention to the repeated gnome.

According to Theodotus, the incarnation is a descent into indignity, and it is contrary to the faith to deny this or any other suffering of Christ. Human nature was created in the image of Christ, but ranking much lower than it.[188] Sin was the main element in the indignity of human nature.[189] The low status of Christ was a key feature of the incarnation, in that God could come near human beings, yet would be hidden from and would not frighten them.[190] The lowness is exemplified by the vocabulary frequently used to describe Christ: servant, slave, fugitive, runaway.[191]

Theodotus condemned those who claim that Christ was actually only a mere (ψιλός) man, for example asking accusingly 'How was the bond of sin against us nailed to the wood (*cf. Col.* 2:14), if a mere human being bore the cross?'[192] At least when undergoing suffering, Christ would have to be a mere human being, if the reasoning of those who 'do not dare to attribute to God human sufferings'[193] was the correct interpretation of scripture.

[185] ACO I 1/2, 72, 9. *Cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 563.

[186] *Cf.* A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben* (1979), 608.

[187] *E.g. Qērellos* 4.1, 124, 1ff. (በእንቲኣነ). It quickly became a widespread anti-Nestorian slogan, after Cyril used it, *e.g. Ep.* 4, ACO I 1/1, 27, 17-8. *Cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 358.

[188] ACO I 1/2, 78, 28ff.

[189] ACO I 1/2, 72, 20. *Cf. ibid.*, 186.

[190] ACO I 1/2, 85, 25ff.

[191] ACO I 1/2, 72, 25ff. *Cf. ibid.*, 469.

[192] ACO I 1/2, 83, 10. *Cf. ibid.*, 300.

[193] ἀνθρώπου πάθη [...] οὐ τολμῶ προσάψαι θεῶι, ACO I 1/2, 83, 1.

Christ, despite his lowness, is not only a human being, that is, he is not a mere (ψιλός) human flesh.[194] Positive or negative references to 'mere man' were employed in critiques and defences of Christological models. Cyril used the theme often against 'Nestorius'.[195] Cyril and those who shared his views emphasised it positively when interpreting the self-emptying of God, and denied it when protecting the divinity of Christ. The opposite images were already important in the fourth century, and their parallel development is not easily described.[196] The Cyrillians seem to have contributed much to the development of such narratives of self-emptying. For example, Cyril used a clear opposition of the divine and the servants,[197] and Theodotus emphasised how pertinent it is to describe Christ as fellow servant or slave.[198]

In Homily II,[199] Theodotus objects to those who would say Christ is a 'mere man'[200] in what is the only mention of Photinus by name. It echoes closely a passage from the *Adversus Noetum* by Ps.-Hippolytus,[201] where Theodotus of Byzantium is said to have maintained that Jesus Christ was indeed just a mere man when born from the virgin.[202] The expression 'mere man' as related to Jesus was at the source of many disputes in the fourth century, especially with monarchianism, and it is hard to identify the specific author of the various strands.

The sense in which Theodotus of Ancyra mentions Photinus is not necessarily the most common at the time of the Council of Ephesus,[203] and the following paragraphs discuss if his portrayal of Photinus' ideas is primarily a caricature or has some connection to his controversial thought. Photinus of Illyricum was a metropolitan bishop of Pannonia who was condemned and deposed in 351, but remained influential and lived on in Sirmium (Valentinian I ordered his expulsion thence in 375). After the formal condemnation at the Council of Constantinople in 381, Photinianism persisted mainly in the West into the fifth century. Some other aspects of his theology find echoes in what Theodotus

[194] ACO I 1/2, 81, 15.

[195] *E.g.* ACO I 1/1, 16, 1-18.

[196] S. Coakley, 'Does Kenosis Rest on a Mistake?' (2006), 249ff.

[197] ACO I 1/1, 20, 12 - 22, 1.

[198] *Qērellos* 4.1, 130, 1, 12ff., ACO I 1/2, 73, 12ff.

[199] ACO I 1/2, 75, 10-2.

[200] For other heresiological links related to 'lowness', see for example Eusebius of Dorylaeum's *Contestatio* (ACO I 1/1, 101-2).

[201] See A. Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church* (1995), 116-27, 206ff. on the controversial authorship and dating.

[202] 'There was a certain Theodotus, a native of Byzantium [... who] maintains that Jesus was a (mere) man, born of a virgin, according to the counsel of the father, [...] he subsequently at his baptism in Jordan received Christ [...]. And this was the reason, (according to Theodotus) why (miraculous) powers did not operate within him prior to the manifestation in him of that Spirit which descended (and) which proclaims him to be the Christ' (Hippolytus, *Adversus Noetum* 3, 5, 224), *cf.* D.H. Williams, 'Monarchianism and Photinus of Sirmium' (2006), 189 footnote 8.

[203] *Cf.* N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 61.

criticises,[204] but he chooses to mention Photinus as heresiarch only in relation to Christology. In Homily II,[205] while Theodotus is questioning the views attributed to Photinus, he moves from a description to a fictional (one-sided) dialogue with a listener, who is to be seen as Photinus. Phrased as a rhetorical attack, the initial reference to Photinus could have been only a labelling of the listener, so as to ascribe his views to a known heresy.

Photinian views were similarly reported, caricaturing them to represent unfavourably the Christologies of either Nestorius or Cyril. The account[206] that Photinus 'taught that Christ was a "mere man" upon whom the word of God rested' is found in Socrates,[207] who notes that 'Photinus held the heresy of Sabellius the Lybian and Paul of Samosata'. However, by the end of the fourth century, the main 'pithy Christological statements'[208] associated with adoptionist monarchian theology in the form of Photinianism were statements about the Son having his beginning from Mary. Cyril mentions the name of Photinus referring to both categories:

> There are some which are possessed by such an impious folly that they claim that the λόγος come from God is without substance, but that it came to the man simply as a λόγος conceived as if expressed outside: thus Marcellus and Photinus.[209]

Also Nestorius was not accurate in his view of the ideas of Photinus when he engaged with either representation of Photinianism. He broadly attributed the discussion about the 'mere man' to Paul of Samosata. When answering Proclus' homilies, he worked with the schematic rendering of the heresy attributed to Photinus which stresses the 'beginning' of the λόγος.[210] Nestorius persistently denied that his view was similar to that of the followers of Photinus, who called Mary 'mother of the man'.[211]

Nevertheless, within the '*Theotokos* conflict', Nestorius 'acquired the reputation among the masses of asserting the blasphemous dogma that the lord is a

[204] In the generation prior to Theodotus, Photinus had been accused of using stoic views – improperly – on Trinitarian issues which were actually mostly on the relation of the Son to God; see D.H. Williams, 'Monarchianism and Photinus of Sirmium' (2006), 202. Theodotus uses similar arguments in his pursuit against reasoning (see p. 189).

[205] ACO I 1/2, 75, 9.

[206] N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 53.

[207] Socrates *h. e.* II, 18, 7; 29, 1-5.

[208] D.H. Williams, 'Monarchianism and Photinus of Sirmium' (2006), 188.

[209] ACO I 1/1, 45.

[210] *Cf.* 'It is absurd to charge me with teaching the error of Photinus, for while Photinus taught that God the word had his origin from Mary, I teach that God the word pre-exists before the ages. On the contrary: that which I assert overthrows the doctrine of Photinus.' ACO I 5/1, 39, 9-17. Discussed in N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 68.

[211] *Heracl.*, I/1, 8, and I/3, 98-9 in G. R. Driver (ed.), *The Bazaar of Heracleides* (1925). See N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 68, similarly L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 64. See also R.M. Hübner, *Die Schrift des Apolinarius* (1989), 182-3, 187-9.

"mere man", and attempting to foist upon the church the dogmas of Paul of Samosata and Photinus'.[212] Nestorius answered this strand of thought in his letter to Celestine, choosing to distinguish the accusations of heresy. He attributed 'mere man' and 'only this one had the beginning from the virgin' to Paul of Samosata. Nestorius claimed that Photinus speaks of another λόγος, different to that one come at the end of times, and said that the λόγος is different from the temple, and does not recognise that God the λόγος became man. According to Nestorius,[213] Photinus ignores the divinity of Christ, that a human being took up divine substance,[214] disregards completely the divinity of the word, existing before the times; further, Photinus confesses the λόγος, but does not recognise that God the λόγος is the Son, lacking, in the incarnation, an individuation into an autonomous subject.

Theodotus' digression against Photinus expresses his antagonism to the 'too strict adherence to Nicaea of Marcellus of Ancyra'.[215] Theodotus opposed Photinus and also greatly cherished the low aspects of the humanity which Christ took up, to better claim that Christ was not only a renowned man.[216] Theodotus held the opinion that it was important for God to be not only a 'normal' human being, but one of low status, because in this way Christ would be 'accessible', would fool the devil,[217] and, more importantly, his deeds would not be wrongly attributed to anything but his true divinity. For example:

- Concerning social aspects of Christ's life, Theodotus claims that 'no one, having feared an excessive richness of Christ, was discouraged; (the) grandeur of a kingdom hindered no one from approaching him, but he was seen as common and poor'.[218]
- When speaking about the involvement of other superhuman forces, Theodotus offers curious narrative accretions. On the one hand, just as neither the law nor the prophets could help humanity out of its fallen state, so neither could the angels, not even those ministering the human race, and Christ does not employ their help.[219] On the other, 'the betrothal deceived the devil

[212] Socrates *h. e.* VII 32, 5-6, analysed in N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 53.

[213] Homily on 12 December 430, F. Loofs (ed.), *Nestoriana* (1905), 304-5, 310, discussed in L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 187, 190.

[214] '*divinam substantia hominem suscepisse*', F. Loofs (ed.), *Nestoriana* (1905), 305.

[215] I. Rucker, 'Ephesinische Konzilsakten in armenischgeorgischer Überlieferung' (1930), 40. Similar attacks, *e.g.* ACO I 1/2, 89, 17ff., suggest that Homilies I and II were later used to highlight the dogmatic importance of texts like Athanasius *Ep. Epict.* (PG26, 1050-70) and Proclus' Homily I, for example in the Armenian-Georgian tradition.

[216] *E.g.* Homily VI.4.

[217] *Cf.* N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 302.

[218] ACO I 1/2, 86, 15.

[219] *Cf.* Homily I, ACO I 1/2, 85, 15-25; 30-1. The especially noteworthy passages are: 'the stronger angel would minister to the nature in view of our salvation, but (any) human being was not saved, (all) being seriously involved in the evils, therefore (absolutely) everything was weak

[since] when the devil heard that generalised grace was likely to be born of a virgin, he plotted against the virginity, hindering moderation from remaining anywhere'.[220] Furthermore, since the incarnation destroys the power of the devil,[221] when Theodotus says 'he (=God) did not wish to frighten the one who became a runaway fugitive of that law, but the lord of all comes in the form of a slave, putting on poverty, in order not to frighten the prey',[222] 'prey' may at the same time refer to all human beings ('the runaway fugitive of the law'), as well as to the devil, which had to be deceived until Christ's death.

- In favour of the credibility of the gospel, the lowness of Christ guaranteed the correct attribution of his deeds to the divinity, and not to a human power.[223]

Theodotus concludes his exposition of the descent into the low state of humanity which he construed with pairs of antithetical statements with the remark that he was 'not diminished with respect to nature'.[224] That is, the divinity of the incarnate one is not lesser than that of the Father. The description of Christology in Homily III, contains extensive passages dedicated to narrative aspects of the descent and lifting, with remarks dwelling on safeguards against 'extremes', which broadly correspond to heresies.[225] Sabellianism was frequently cited, as seen in the *florilegium* used to describe the Nestorian error in the session of 22 June, where quotes 10[226] and 23[227] exemplify this.

Theodotus expressed the Christological narrative with words related in various ways to low social classes or aspects of human life, allowing him significant narrative elaboration and a fruitful use of this lexicon in homilies. For example, associated to 'man' described[228] as a 'runaway slave' are fearfulness, a state of dependance and of error, as well as master or from whom he flees. 'Fugitive' and cognate expressions allow Theodotus to expand the theological narrative based on semantic and scriptural associations. Thus, in the context of the flight to Egypt mentioned in Homily VI he stresses that Jesus became a

for the negligence of human beings', and 'he (=Christ) does not introduce a guard of archangels (*cf. Matt.* 26:53); he does not incite the armies of angels.'

[220] Homily V, 4 M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 227, 7; 12-3.

[221] *E.g.* the accusation 'Why do you say that the cross is not of God, by which God triumphed over the evil of the devil?' (ACO I 1/2, 88, 31-2).

[222] ACO I 1/2, 85, 31-2.

[223] ACO I 1/2, 86, 1-8.

[224] ACO I 1/2, 72, 9. *Cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 179, N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 110, M. Simonetti, 'Alcune osservazioni sul monofisismo di Cirillo' (1982), 493.

[225] See p. 104 on the use of possible associations to heresies as reciprocal attacks. *Cf. Ibid.*, 502.

[226] ACO I 1/2, 48, 11-4.

[227] ACO I 1/2, 51, 17-26.

[228] *E.g.* ACO I 1/2, 72, 25ff., ACO I 1/2, 79, 7-11. *Cf.* J.H. Barkhuizen, *Proclus, Bishop of Constantinople – Homilies on the Life of Christ* (2001), 42-3.

fugitive.[229] For the sake of humanity the incarnated fled, since there were people menacing his life.[230]

Visibility, appearance and nearness

The visible word, the appearance of Christ, and the nearness of God to his creation are important components of Theodotus' Christological account. After the incarnation, God has a more direct relation to humanity, when compared to the Old Testament, which is described in Homily II:

> The invisible God becomes seen; the word is touched; the only-begotten child of God becomes akin with the slaves, in order that the nature, transgressing the human being, may not escape the notice of the investigation of human beings. [...] For long ago the presence of God was prepared beforehand, his appearing was always made known by human shapes, desiring to be seen through resources that have influence with us.[231]

In the time of the law, God worked wonders and interacted with his faithful by means of angels, prophets, signs and wonders. The concrete closeness of Christ is not only expressed by his visibility and materiality (which men could touch), but also expressed by the 'becoming near' (παραγίνομαι).[232]

Theodotus' frequent pairing of the visible and invisible,[233] and the touchable and untouchable is strongly associated with the possibility of human beings apprehending the divine nature of God. Without stepping out of the narrative approach to Christology, Theodotus says in Homily II, 2 that God becomes similar (συγγενὴς γίνεται) to human beings in order that men do not remain deprived of the knowledge of God, who 'is unattainable to human reasoning because of the divinity of (his) nature'.[234]

All the many variants in which Theodotus expresses how human beings may cognise God once he became incarnate are related to the epiphany, revelation and disclosure which God offers to mankind. God chooses a course of action which overcomes human limitations. Human faculties of perception, cognition and intellection are not altered by the incarnation, since humanity is not lifted out of its former state regarding these.[235] Rather, the relation to God is changed

[229] *Qērellos* 4.1, 122, 14ff.

[230] See the section on p. 141 for possible 'real world' parallels. *Cf.* S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004), 210.

[231] ACO I 1/2, 74, 12-6.

[232] *E.g.* ACO I 1/2, 72, 25. *Cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 266, 477.

[233] Although ὁρατός and ἀόρατος are both related to ὁράω, which is usually translated as 'to see' (so that most Nicene creed translations have 'seen and unseen'), Theodotus employs them with a strong emphasis on the (im)possibility of being seen, which is best rendered as (in)visible. Therefore, when translating I try to use 'seen' only for the participles ὁρώμενος. *Cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 267, 481.

[234] ACO I 1/2, 74, 5-6.

[235] ACO I 1/2, 74, 13-5.

to a closer and more accurate knowledge when God grants men awareness of some divine characteristics.[236] Theodotus kept the description of human apprehension of God apart from the exegesis of 'emptying', where he emphasised the descent of God to the human nature.[237] The tactic to keep the two aspects in separate paragraphs may have served to counter Nestorius' teaching, where frequently the mention of the opposing visible-invisible pair came related to references to the kenosis. Still, for both authors the human nature of Christ was an instrument which made the invisible nature seen.[238]

Theodotus often describes the human limitations in Christ in connection with the use of a vocabulary of 'appearance'. For example, when summing up a Christological passage, just before the epilogue of Homily III:

> what appeared was made believable by the sufferings, and the hidden one was shown by the wonders.[239]

τὸ φαινόμενον and τὸν κρυπτόμενον work as antithetical pairs just as invisible and visible are used to describe the God of the Old Testament and the God of the New Testament, respectively. Nevertheless, Theodotus literally says that God 'appears' as a human being. τὸ φαινόμενον and τὸν κρυπτόμενον state antithetically Christ's modes of existence, and are in climactic end-position (in Greek, the phrases share the rhythmic pattern 'dative – verb – participle subject').

Other words from the semantic field of φαίνω, often used emphatically, occur, for example, in 'Thus he appears as a human being', or, in Homily II, 'the manifestation of God that appeared to human beings in the nature of a human being'.[240] The semantic range of the words in many modern languages can suggest to present-day readers that such passages present a docetic view of the incarnation, which is, however, an anachronistic and mistaken understanding.[241]

Life, crucifixion

When Theodotus expands *Philippians* 2, for example in Homily III,[242] he renders freely the whole life of Christ in a paragraph. After a detailed polemic exegesis of verses 5-6, with ample use of paraphrases and variations, and particular

[236] ACO I 1/2, 74, 17-20.

[237] ACO I 1/2, 75, 1-5.

[238] A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben* (1979), 658, L. Abramowski. *Untersuchungen zum Liber Heraclidis des Nestorius* (1963).

[239] καὶ γὰρ τοῖς πάθεσιν ἐπιστοῦτο τὸ φαινόμενον καὶ τοῖς θαύμασιν ἐδείκνυ τὸν κρυπτόμενον. ACO I 1/2, 73, 18.

[240] ACO I 1/2, 74, 17. Figures of speech emphasise the root φαιν-: 'ἐμφανείαι φανείσηι'.

[241] Likewise, J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 218-9 refutes criticism of doceticism in Cyril's Christological works. Theodotus' opposition to doceticism, however, focused on the 'taking only the form of man', and not also the sufferings. See PG77, 1341B.

[242] ACO I 1/2, 73, 1-12.

attention to the names of Christ Jesus,[243] the remainder of the Pauline chapter is echoed in the allusions to other scriptural passages representing Christ's life. Theodotus leads the discussion about the names to an exegesis of *Luke* 1:31, with references to the nativity and infancy of Christ. The paragraph then follows *Philippians* 2 closely, while Theodotus represents Christ's experience of human suffering, and at the same time, his performance of superhuman wonders.

At the end of the argument about Christology in Homily III,[244] Theodotus provides a tour de force of biblical allusions and paraphrases, not unlike what preceded the exegesis of *Phil.* 2:6.[245] The final exegetical flourish is a selection of remarkable events of Christ's life that are related to displays of his suffering. It is built of brief sentences which are bound together by figures of speech, never repeated more than a couple of times, like alliteration, regular syntactical patterns emphasised by participles and nouns that decline similarly, and rhythmic variation of the conjunctions. The references suffice to encompass the whole of Christ's life, from birth in a manger to the fear of death on the cross. Initially, the first half of the clauses are allusions to *Philippians* 2, representing the human in the incarnate one, to which the remainder of the clauses opposes the wonders performed by Christ, as signs of his divinity. Theodotus refers to many other topics of *Philippians* 2 without citing them literally. He dwells on these images, expands his discourse, while delaying the reference to the cross (*Phil.* 2:8).

Theodotus gradually distances himself from *Philippians* 2, so that when he addresses (Christ's) 'obedience up to the Cross' (*Phil.* 2:8), he speaks of withdrawing (ὑποστέλλω) of the Cross. Theodotus uses this 'shrinking from the Cross' as a sign of (Christ's) humanity, for it refers to the utmost example of passibility (it is the high point and concluding image in the sequence of allusions to scripture). It signals the suffering-fullness of the death of Christ. Thus, one can say, following Theodotus' words, that with the death of Christ on the cross both aspects (signs of humanity and super-human wondrous displays of divinity) become concrete in the same event: it is an unquestionable sign of passibility, and it is the culmination of the incarnation. By it the devil is defeated, and hell is opened. Theodotus considered this victory to be obtained not only by the divine power, but also by its concealment in human form.[246]

In Homily I, a festal sermon for a nativity celebration, extensive passages discuss the crucifixion. It is not only one more example of suffering taken up by God, but also the means by which death is destroyed by death, by which human sin is crucified on the cross, because God made the death his own.[247]

[243] See p. 185.
[244] ACO I 1/2, 73, 1-5.
[245] ACO I 1/2, 72, 25-30.
[246] ACO I 1/2, 79, 29-34.
[247] ACO I 1/2, 83, 5. *Cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 365.

Furthermore, relating the crucifixion to *1Cor.* 1:23,[248] it becomes the paradigm of suffering which those in error – equated to Jews and Gentiles – wish to deny of the incarnate God. Theodotus places those in Christological error in direct descent of the roots of any heresy. Theodotus used 'Jew' as an interjection to offend an interlocutor, whether present or absent, usually in the context of the exegesis or of references to *1Cor.* 1:23, where the Jews are one archetype of those who deny or doubt the sufferings of Christ.[249]

Theodotus' Christological vocabulary

Theodotus expressed several aspects of a 'theory of language' and of his view of the 'nature of human discourse' in his homilies, while talking about the divine word, and its coming to be in human form, unchanged but apprehended differently. Human language is an example of the limitations of parallels used to describe divine matters and at the same time the tool to show the imperfection of the models. In Homily II,[250] such metalinguistics is central to Theodotus' Christological argument. The excursus on *sacra* is the climax of a reflection on language with theological implications, exploring the meanings of λόγος. It is a metaphysical awareness of the importance of the written text which is also found well developed in Cyril.[251]

The model chosen by Theodotus[252] is a parallel between the content of a discourse and its material representation. It has both advantages and disadvantages over other metalinguistic metaphors used to further the understanding of Christology, such as the well known example by Theodore of Mopsuestia.[253] Theodore uses an analogy with robes and clothing, which a king wears to show something, but they are not his nature.[254] Theodotus speaks of the letters,

[248] 'Christ crucified, [...] a scandal for the Jews, [...] a folly for the Gentile.'

[249] See p. 107.

[250] ACO I 1/2, 76, 22-31, 77, 10-35, ACO I 1/2, 79, 34 - 80, 29.

[251] Not only the author of pamphlets and theological treatises, he also became an expert of philology, and an advocate for authoritative versions. T. Graumann, 'Kirchliche Identität und bischöfliche Selbstinszenierung' (2003), 210.

[252] ACO I 1/2, 79, 34 - 80, 29. *Cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 285ff.

[253] From Theodore *Contra Eunomium*: 'Was für den König Purpurgewänder oder königliche Kleider sind, das ist für den Gott-Logos der Anfang, den er aus uns genommen hat, unzertrennlich, unveräußerlich, ohne (räumliche) Entfernung in der Anbetung. Wie der König also nicht durch Natur Purpurgewänder hat, so hat auch nicht der Gott-Logos durch Natur Fleisch.' Translation: A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben* (1979), 628.

[254] '[D]er König trägt Purpurgewänder, um seine Stellung zum Ausdruck zu bringen. Sie sind aber nicht seine Natur oder Substanz. So wächst auch Christi menschliche Natur nicht zusammen mit dem Logos in eine Wesenheit, sondern erhält (nur) dieselbe Ehre und Anbetung wie der Logos. Das *Prosopon* Christi ist so der letzte Ausdruck der engen Verbindung, die zwischen Christi Menschheit und der Hypostase des Logos besteht. Das Beispiel der königlichen Gewänder

syllables, ink and paper a discourse takes on when written down, but are not itself – surely not its content.[255] The words have, or symbolise, content in a different, more intrinsic, way than robes, and correlate more easily to the ἀσώματος of the divine nature which is the divine characteristic at the centre of both authors' analysis. However, Theodotus' probably deliberate (because rich) ambiguous use of λόγος, referring to either or both divine and human λόγος, introduces imprecision into his approach. Theodotus was perhaps echoing the primarily Alexandrian tradition of similes to writing.[256] It served to rival a pattern of Christological metaphors which is encapsulated in Theodore's version.[257] Noteworthily, both Theodotus' and Theodore's images refer to secular authority and its signs.[258]

Theodotus' choices of words also seems to reflect his concern with language. An example is the preference for verbs in various prefixed forms without apparent detriment to the clarity of a passage.[259] Theodotus also used a number of rare words,[260] although the homilies transmitted in collections of conciliar documents do not attest this, perhaps because of editorial interventions. Some are words coined only in the previous century, or whose use in a religious context was new, and which never became widespread. In some cases, the words apparently are not attested before him, and some expressions seem to have remained *hapax legomena*.[261]

könnte geeignet sein, diese Verbindung als eine äußere, zufällige hinzustellen. Aber Theodore betont aufs stärkste, daß es sich um eine einzigartige Verbindung handelt, eine unzerstörbare, unveräußerliche, die durch keine äußere Distanz aufgelöst werden kann'. In *ibid.*, 628.

[255] ACO I 1/2, 80, 1-10.

[256] See the wide range of similes to writing in F.M. Young, *Biblical Exegesis* (1997), 106 and the parallels cited in *ead.*, 'God's image' (2011), 60, 65, on the relation between image and archetype in fourth-century controversies where the image of the king/emperor is a recurrent analogy.

[257] For metalinguistic Trinitarian models related to imperial authority, compare Athanasius *Ar.* 3, 5, K. Metzler *et al.* (eds), *Oratio III contra Arianos* (2000), 311, and Basil *Spir.* 18 (PG32, 149C).

[258] The discussion about the meaning of *sacra* is as much a reflection on language as on government. Theodotus often speaks of the excesses of might of kings and emperors (for example, Homily I, ACO I 1/2, 85, 30ff.), but in this passage he upholds the imperial authority. In Ancyra it could have served to defend why a bishop would obey secular rulers; in Ephesus, it could mirror the claims of gathering in Ephesus 'promptly', discussing the faith, *etc.* in obedience to the imperial summon, and in the collections, it would add to the desired image of an obedient and cooperative Cyrillian party. *E.g.* benevolent explicit reference to emperors: Cyril *Hom. div.* 7, ACO I 1/2, 101, 30 - 102, 2.

[259] Contrast the repetition of γίγνομαι in ACO I 1/2, 83, 1-23 with verbs prefixed with προσ-, συν-, παρα- in ACO I 1/2, 83, 24-37.

[260] Based on G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (1961) and searches in TLG. However, the absence of Homily IV is an obvious example of the shortcomings of the database, which make vocabulary surveys little reliable when performed beyond a well defined group of texts, *cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 228.

[261] In Homily I, μοσχευτός (ACO I 1/2, 81, 3). Most examples are found in Homily IV, such as ἐκπόθητος, προσιλιγγιᾷ, and κώδεσις for Latin 'caudex' – not in G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (1961), and translated back to Latin as *vellus* (fleece) in PG77, 1394B. G.W.H. Lampe,

Thus, Theodotus continues a trend of great freedom not only in modulating but also in constructing new lexemes manifested especially by fourth-century theologians. Gregory Nazianzen defended this 'innovating as regards the names for the sake of clarity'.[262] In the fourth century, it can be explained by the need for a new conceptual framework in which to express Christian worship and doctrine with the necessary precision.[263] At least in the vicinity of Antioch, the 'tradition of innovation' was still alive at the turn of the fifth century, as attested by Asterius.[264]

Theodotus' rare words echo the difficult theological issues dealt with in the florid and elaborate passages where they occur. Audience and readers may have valued the choice of compound (formed by adding prefixes) or derived words (crossing the adjective, noun, verb boundaries) as a sign of erudition, or interpreted it as a search for more precision. Theodotus mostly employed standard processes of lexical derivation, ensuring that his discourse remained clear and approachable. Instances of ambiguous words in important contexts ought not to be dismissed as accidental.[265] Cyrillian and Antiochene writers alike spoke of the need of greater clarity and precision to surpass what were quite patent lexical limitations and boundaries which impeded suitable ways of talking about the divine mysteries, and acknowledged the shortcomings of human abilities when confronted with the limitless attributes of God.[266]

In the following sections, Theodotus' use of a few words important in the Christological debate is analysed. The small corpus of extant works allows only tentative conclusions, since general descriptions[267] fit several authors alike, and in the setting and among the documents of the Council of Ephesus themes,

A Patristic Greek Lexicon (1961) gives Homily IV.3 as only example for ἀγαλλίασμα, to which TLG adds Cyril *Glaphyra in Pentateuchum*, and then only Pseudo-Macarius *Hom. sp.* 50, 17, or later writers like Procopius, Theodorus Studites and Georgius Chortatzes. Finally, in Homily V.5, 24 ('the holy Spirit is the sanctifying power of the maker'), Theodotus employs ἁγιαστικός (with δύναμις), an adjective used as a special attribute of the Holy Spirit, coined during the Trinitarian debate (occurring also with ἐνέργεια), which becomes rather widespread in the writings of the church fathers up to the fifth century, after which it is much less used and changes its meaning to be used mostly in a liturgical context. Theodotus already employs the adjective as part of a formula within a quite elaborate syntax, but the passage reflects a – possibly indirect – acquaintance with the vocabulary of the Cappadocian fathers.

[262] *Oratio* 39, 12 (PG36, 348B), C. Moreschini and P. Gallay (eds), *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 38-41* (1990), 174, 16f.

[263] Social and political factors for Christianity's 'progressive' attitude in relation to the Greek linguistic heritage are discussed in W. Kinzig, 'The idea of progress' (1993), 123ff., K.K. Banev, *Pastoral polemics* (2008), 68.

[264] More than sixty *hapax legomena* in the thirty-one *Homilies on the psalms*: W. Kinzig (ed.), *Asterius. Psalmenhomilien* (2002). See K.K. Banev, *Pastoral polemics* (2008), 67-8.

[265] See p. 61.

[266] *Cf.* B. Meunier, *Le Christ de Cyrille* (1997), 275, L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 83.

[267] *E.g.* M. Simonetti, 'Alcune osservazioni sul monofisismo di Cirillo' (1982), 193-5.

examples, citations, and patterns recurred, and alliances were recognised mostly in shared ways of speaking. Details of vocabulary allow some insights.[268]

First, a section discusses Theodotus' formulaic use of ἐνυπόστατος and οὐσιώδης, placing him in the environs of Cyril's use of Cappadocian theological concepts. Then are examined some occurrences of οἰκονομία, a concept around which Theodotus structures his theology and anthropology. Finally, a few passages on φύσις are analysed where Theodotus' usage of the term suggests his Christology may be described as tending towards monophysite views.

ἐνυπόστατος, οὐσιώδης

These words, especially ἐνυπόστατος, have received much attention in modern theology, largely assuming they have a technical meaning in patristic works. The complex history of their ancient use is now better understood,[269] as a result of a reassessment of contemporary Christology,[270] and research of late antique philosophy.[271] The usage of the words by fifth-century authors which do not seem to have contributed directly to the post-Chalcedonian development is still largely ignored. An analysis of the passages where Theodotus employs them contributes insights into the spread of theological formulae where echoes and influence are hard to set apart. Theodotus' usage corroborates the insight[272] that it had no technical meaning yet, but was a tentative borrowing from Stoic anthropology.[273] Usually ἐνυπόστατος,[274] the adjective proper of ὑπόστασις occurs conjoined with οὐσιώδης,[275] what pertains to the οὐσία.[276] Once ἐνυπόστατος is used in isolation.[277]

The adjectives qualify the divine λόγος in passages where human language is a parallel or contrasting example.[278] While ἐνυπόστατος seems restricted

[268] *E.g.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), G. Richter, *Oikonomia* (2005), E. Schwartz, *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431* (1927), A. Grillmeier, 'Die anthropologisch-christologische Sprache des Leontius' (1990).

[269] See B. Gleede, *The Development of the Term ἐνυπόστατος* (2012).

[270] See F.LR. Shults, 'A Dubious Christological Formula' (1996).

[271] C. Erismann, 'A world of hypostases' (2011).

[272] A. Grillmeier, 'Die anthropologisch-christologische Sprache des Leontius' (1990), 72.

[273] Also, F.LR. Shults, 'A Dubious Christological Formula' (1996), 431.

[274] Natural, subsistent, inherent or just enhypostatic.

[275] Essential, substantial.

[276] ACO I 1/2, 81, 16-7, 24-5, ACO I 1/2, 77, 35, also ACO I 1/2, 80, 16.

[277] ACO I 1/2, 76, 24-6.

[278] G.L. Castro, 'Citazione di uno Ps.-Teodoto d'Ancira' (1992), 365 argues that Theodotus was not at ease with the vocabulary of hypostasis, preferring the 'economy' vocabulary over expressions like καθ ὑπόστασιν. As discussed in the next session, Theodotus used and referred often to οἰκονομία in a wide range of meanings, but since οἰκονομία was also a central concept

to late antique and Byzantine literature,[279] οὐσιώδης is widely attested in Ancient Greek, for example, in Plutarch. It was a common technical term especially in medical texts,[280] which was then used in theological discussions, incorporating its 'metaphysical' usage by Aristotelian commentators, apparently developed by Alexander of Aphrodisias.

οὐσιώδης τε καὶ ἐνυπόστατος functions as a set phrase with which to qualify the incarnate word in contexts where it is already clear that the reference is to the divine λόγος (for example, by the qualification as θεοῦ or ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεγεννημένον). While the locution increases the clarity and enhances the importance of the passage, it also seems to expand the ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί of the Nicene creed, taking into account the vocabulary of hypostasis. In the guise of a prolonged epithet it resembles a credal formula where interpolations were not meant as changes but added interpretations.[281]

It has been claimed that Cyril of Alexandria was 'really fond' of the term ἐνυπόστατος and that in all occurrences where it applies to a part of the Trinity, it has a technical Trinitarian meaning but is not a Christological term.[282] It has also been claimed that in the Christological debate, the words ἐνυπόστατος and οὐσιώδης were shunned by the 'orthodox party'.[283] It is easy to see that most instances are in early works, and for the present discussion, that Cyril only used both adjectives together in texts that predate the Council of Ephesus.[284] Cyril typically put these adjectives alongside other qualifications of the Son, for example, in *Commentarii in Joannem*, respectively δύναμις φυσική and ζῶν λόγος.[285] The passages actually exemplify Cyril's early approach to the Christological argument,[286] and the current scholarly opinion has largely overlooked that he used ἐνυπόστατος in some of his most polemical Christological treatises, especially in *De recta fide ad Theodosium*.[287]

for the compilers of concilar documentation and the set of works is small, Castro's conclusion seems precipitate.

[279] See B. Gleede, *The Development of the Term ἐνυπόστατος* (2012), 11-3.

[280] See the entry in H.G. Liddell *et al.* (eds), *A Greek-English Lexicon* (1996). TLG lists several instances in Galenus and Aretaeus.

[281] *Cf.* L.H. Westra, *The Apostles' Creed* (2002), 540ff., B. Gleede, *The Development of the Term ἐνυπόστατος* (2012), 29-33.

[282] See *ibid.*, 38-41.

[283] G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (1961), 485-6. The Orientals also rarely used these expressions, and usually in a Trinitarian context.

[284] The only examples in which Cyril is known to have used both adjectives together are in *Commentarii in Joannem*, *Thesaurus de sancta consubstantiali trinitate* (PG75, 580, 7-8), and in the spurious *De sancta trinitate* (PG77).

[285] P.E. Pusey (ed.), *Cyrilli in D. Joannis Evangelium* (1872) I, 70, 10-6; II, 714, 16-7. See B. Gleede, *The Development of the Term ἐνυπόστατος* (2012), 38-40.

[286] C.A. Beeley, 'Cyril of Alexandria and Gregory Nazianzen' (2009), 386.

[287] ACO I 1/1, 50f. Also in *Duodecim capitum defensio adversus orientales episcopos*, ACO I 1/7, 51.

Theodotus is the only author to employ both words together in works contained in ACO,[288] but there are four more uses of ἐνυπόστατος, all in Cyril's works. It occurs in his letters to the monks,[289] to the emperor,[290] and to Maximian,[291] and also in his brief exposition on the incarnation.[292] Cyril also employs the word in a Trinitarian digression when he presents a 'heretical' attack[293] against Anathema 9.[294]

The circulation before the Council of Ephesus of Cyril's works containing ἐνυπόστατος and especially of the passages where the combined locution occurs is unclear. Theodotus may have become acquainted with this phrase via Cyril, but his audience in Ancyra and in Ephesus may not have known them. The passages in both Cyril's and Theodotus' works are representative of the links of the early fifth-century Christological debate to the fourth-century Trinitarian disputes and show that outside the original polemic a freer use of the formulae reveals their shortcomings and contradictions.[295] Theodotus' usage suggests he was not looking for controversial words. It seems that the occurrence of ἐνυπόστατος in the works of the Cappadocians was more important than the use in credal works to contextualise the word in an authoritative patristic tradition. Since Theodotus used a set phrase more often than ἐνυπόστατος alone, it is likely that he had contact with only a small part of the works where the term is used, yet direct knowledge of Gregory of Nyssa and/or Epiphanius is possible.[296]

The use of these words by Theodotus, Cyril and others, albeit in a Christological context, does not seem to have had any direct influence on later generations.[297] Rather, in the sixth century, as part of the lexical developments in the reception of Chalcedonian Christology,[298] ἐνυπόστατος, ὑπόστασις, ἐνούσιον

[288] E. Schwartz, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum* (1914ff.).

[289] ACO I 1/1, 15, 7-11.

[290] ACO I 1/1, 51, 15-8.

[291] ACO I 1/3, 72, 14-6.

[292] Cyr., *Inc.*, ACO I 1/5, 4, 19.

[293] Usually identified with Andrew of Samosata's views.

[294] Cyr., *Apol. orient.* ACO I 1/7, 51, 30-2.

[295] B. Gleede, *The Development of the Term ἐνυπόστατος* (2012), 40.

[296] In the Trinitarian discussion, the phrase had likewise been used about the λόγος by Gregory of Nyssa, for example, in *Oratio catechetica magna*, J.H. Srawley (ed.), *The Catechetical Oration* (1903), Section 8, 153-5, and, employed in reference to the Spirit, in *Adversus Macedonianos de spiritu sancto*, F. Müller (ed.), *Gregorii Nysseni Opera* (1958), III 1, 102, 26-9. The words occur in a similar way in Epiphanius *Panarion*, K. Holl (ed.), *Epiphanius* (1985) III, 365, 5-9.

[297] G.L. Castro, *Cirillo di Alessandria: Epistole cristologiche* (1999), 84, however, claims that the unceasing use of this term in the Christological debate of 'subsequent centuries' refers 'clearly' to Theodotus. See also *id.*, *Teodoto di Ancira* (1992), 76.

[298] This technical usage is exemplified in several passages of Eustathius *Epistula ad Timotheum scholasticum de duabus naturis adversus Severum*, and in the works of Leontius of Byzantium and John Philopponus. See K.-H. Uthemann, *Christus, Kosmos, Diatribe* (2005), 62, 78. Leontius acknowledges (PG86.1277C) a rupture with traditional vocabulary. See H. Stickelberger,

and οὐσία were differentiated more precisely. Theologians claimed to be in the tradition of Gregory of Nyssa, John Chrysostom, Cyril and Theodotus, yet they would no longer use the words convertibly nor the set phrase as an ornament.

οἰκονομία

As other theologians of his time, Theodotus used οἰκονομία and related words in a wide array of meanings, from the colloquial reference to a household, to exegetical and technical theological and church political significations.[299] Theodotus' audience seems to have grasped the range of associations he drew from an expression whose technical theological meaning was not yet settled.[300]

Theodotus used the household as an image of dealing with human affairs when he spoke to and about a church which ought to engage with human matters, and should do so in the usual ways of the world. Economy encompasses the whole relation of God to the creation, especially to humans. To describe the economy more conveniently for the limited human intellect,[301] Theodotus' use of its semantic field gradually shifts from administrator of the household, in a reference to Joseph, to God as the 'dispenser of the unbelievable'.[302] Even if Theodotus says that God 'takes up childbirth as the beginning of the economy',[303] he does not follow this idea consistently. He sees all topics related to Christ, especially the incarnation, as key aspects of the economy.

The economy binds the narrative, and sometimes describes the account itself. Theodotus uses economy as an abstract concept[304] to describe the σκοπός[305] which God has for humanity.[306] In other passages, it refers only to some aspects of the divine intervention in the created (and especially in the human) world.

'Substanz und Akzidens bei Leontinus' (1980), 158, J. Meyendorff, 'Continuities and Discontinuities' (1993), 75.

[299] G. Richter, *Oikonomia* (2005), 359-425, focused on Cyril's works prior to the council, provides some context for Theodotus' usage. See also G.L. Castro, *Teodoto di Ancira* (1992), 29.

[300] *Cf.* G. Richter, *Oikonomia* (2005), 540.

[301] Homily V.7, 5, 9-15.

[302] Homily V.3, 22.

[303] ACO I 1/2, 81, 30, PG77, 1345B.

[304] 'τὸ τῆς οἰκονομίας', ACO I 1/2, 73, 7-8. The Latin translation in PG77, 1390A as well as A.J. Festugière, *Ephèse et Chalcédoine: actes* (1982), 269 avoided the lack of definiteness and specified it as 'mystery'.

[305] As the goal of a text σκοπός was used in late antiquity both in scriptural exegesis, and in grammatical and rhetorical commentaries. See, for example, M. Harl, 'Le guetteur et la cible' (1961), 454ff., F.M. Young, *Biblical Exegesis* (1997), 24-30, 190; M.J. Carruthers, *The Craft of Thought* (1998), 79-82, 262; A. Spira and H.R. Drobner, *Kleine Schriften* (2007), 291, H.M. Meissner, 'Grammatik und Rhetorik' (1993), 225-7.

[306] ACO I 1/2, 73, 13. ACO I 1/2, 82, 34-6. *Cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 290.

In Homily III, while attacking the views of the incarnation which would make Christ's action no longer bring salvation,[307] Theodotus presents a narrative of Christ's deeds to describe the economy.[308] However, economy can also refer to the continuing action of God in this world.[309] At the beginning of the homily, οἰκονομέω is the verb employed to say that the grace of the Spirit brought the holy priesthood into being, and sustains each generation of priests.[310] This is closely related to the incarnation, since the holy priesthood to which Theodotus refers is only the Christian priesthood, which comes into existence with Christ and his sending forth of the Spirit.

At the end of Homily III, Theodotus encompasses the audience in a divine plan, for whose sake the incarnation happened,[311] using οἰκειότητα.[312] Its non-theological sense of community and collectiveness with a hierarchical element, where the members gain their importance from the head of the house, may reflect the council – where the outcome is given by the univocal voting –, or the community of the church. Every human being can be described as the 'servant' (οἰκέτης) whom God comes to save.[313] Indeed, in the Roman household οἰκειότητα was a normal way to allude to the collective not only of servants, but of all in the house.[314] Theodotus goes from and beyond the Roman household to the divine household, moving from a relation to a man to that to God. This relation is marked by closeness arising from mutual roles, where the head cares for the members. In a world described as οἰκουμένη,[315] the faithful are led to a state characterised by a relation to God modelled on human terms, which represents their salvation.

φύσις

As a last case study of Theodotus' theological vocabulary, attention is drawn to φύσις, which he apparently preferred to use unqualified,[316] for the θεικῆς φύσεως or θεότης.[317] Theodotus often used φύσις in Christ, God, the λόγος without any further specification as if he trusted that the words he employed would encompass the meaning he desired conveniently, reflecting his stance on

[307] ACO I 1/2, 72, 7, ACO I 1/2, 90, 1-4.
[308] ACO I 1/2, 73, 15-9.
[309] ACO I 1/2, 73, 14, ACO I 1/2, 90, 2.
[310] ACO I 1/2, 71, 24-5. See *John* 20:21-2.
[311] ACO I 1/2, 73, 23.
[312] ACO I 1/2, 73, 19.
[313] ACO I 1/2, 73, 13, exegesis of *Phil.* 2:5-7. See p. 184.
[314] The image of the household was meant to be benign, but it nevertheless reflected a rigid and authoritarian social structure.
[315] ACO I 1/2, 73, 21.
[316] ACO I 1/2, 72, 6-7; ACO I 1/2, 72, 15.
[317] ACO I 1/2, 81, 20-7; ACO I 1/2, 81, 30-1; ACO I 1/2, 81, 33-4. *Cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 275.

the clarity derived from fewer words.[318] Theodotus does not seem aware of the risk that the passages could be read meaning that there is only one nature: probably (only) a divine nature, with human attributes. In such a reading the body of Christ is still Christ's own, without any division, and therefore God suffers insofar as his own body suffers. Thus, as regards the sufferings, the conclusion is the same as would be reached assuming Theodotus alluded to both human and divine natures in Christ when he says φύσις. His manner of expressing avoids the criticism he levels at those 'who divide the human being from God's word and who separate what was made one by the mention of the natures, who say that Christ is certain two things and who convey the <one> only by reflection, for contention.'[319]

Observing Theodotus' way of speaking about φύσις in Christ naturally brings up the question whether his Christology was miaphysite or dyophysite. These labels are rather anachronistic, and in 431 there was a wide range of more or less 'miaphysite' or 'dyophysite' theologians:

> Whether [Theodotus] thought that there was 'only one nature in Christ and that a divine nature', as 'monophysitism' used often most misleadingly to be defined, or not (probably not), he did think that the incarnation could be illustrated and its possibility explained by the turning of the Nile into blood. I would not judge objectionable calling such a view 'monophysite'; it is certainly almost the opposite of Babai.[320]

Instead of circumventing the issues raised by Theodotus' vocabulary because of the anachronistic problems it prompted, it seems that the reception of his works can help to understand them. At stake is not if Theodotus can be read as a precursor of Monophysitism, since the Syriac and Ethiopic manuscript tradition attests sufficiently the appeal of his works for later Miaphysites. Rather, the aim is to discuss if his Christology was perceived as such in his time and presented problems for Chalcedonians. The latter concern can be disregarded, since Theodotus was considered a saint by the Orthodox (Chalcedonian) church throughout the Middle Ages.[321] Theodotus was read in a 'Chalcedonian' way, for example, when *Expositio symboli Nicaeni* was used to preface Zeno *Henoticon*.[322] In his time, neither Cyrillians or Orientals, nor readers of Theodotus' texts in the aftermath of the Council of Chalcedon left remarks about his way of speaking about 'nature' (of and in Christ, Jesus, God, *etc.*). Theodotus makes no statement about his practice of omitting further qualification of a noun like φύσις. However, outside this religious and linguistic setting, in order

[318] Objections against verbosity were common among the writings of the fathers, and were the basis for Theodotus' criticism of λογισμοί, further discussed on p. 181.

[319] ACO I 1/2, 86, 31-3; *app. ad. loc.* on the manuscript and *florilegia* evidence for ἓν (l.32).

[320] L.R. Wickham, 'Review of *The Dyophysite Christology*' (2010). *Cf.* M. Simonetti, 'Alcune osservazioni sul monofisismo di Cirillo' (1982), 498 (footnote 20).

[321] See p. 125.

[322] For example, Pio. II. 2; Vat. gr. 1492, 1655, 1664.

to preserve the tradition of reading Theodotus as orthodox, the Latin translations, for example, regularly added adjectives, like divine, to these passages.[323] Thereby the translators effectively hid that aspect of Theodotus' theology.

The same happens with a passage where Theodotus claims that God is not connected to suffering by his own nature, but through union to suffering. A suffering nature (*e.g.* a human nature) must not be associated to Christ's being, πάθος is united to the (one) nature.[324] The choice of most translators to add clarifying words and phrases[325] suggests that in their view Theodotus' Christology was murky and that he lacked the confidence and familiarity with the 'right' vocabulary to express himself. The sonority of the phrase that helped Theodotus to dazzle the audience would in this view also have distracted them from the vagueness of his vocabulary. Theodotus' coherent criticism of others suggests he thought his was a clear Christological formulation, and as such he highlighted it, for example, with rhythmic use of the vocabulary of suffering and the repetition of π and φ.

The beginning of Homily III.2 is another passage relevant for the discussion of Theodotus' understanding of φύσις, and of unclear translation because it is difficult to identify the speaker of 'if you are looking at the nature, you see well'.[326] The speaker may be the fictional character (Nestorius), or Theodotus as an answer to his question, since 'if you take away completely the suffering, you deny the economy' can also be seen as a reply to the preceding phrase. Theodotus tries to make the attribution of the catch-phrase 'deny that God has suffered' to Nestorianism more vivid by placing it into a fictional dialogue. The ambiguity prevents the use of this passage as a key text for Theodotus' particular Christological views at the time of the council. In short, exactly what Theodotus meant by 'nature' (φύσις) remains elusive. Despite the importance of Christology in Theodotus' homilies in conciliar collections, the texts yield only a small set of technical passages. Comparing them with the great number of Christological works Cyril wrote between 428 and 431, it seems that 'φύσις is more likely to mean individual nature than separate reality'.[327]

Cyril's technical vocabulary of nature[328] was related to the achievements of the Cappadocians in the context of the Trinitarian debate.[329] Cyril's early

[323] For example, the first passage of Homily III quoted in this section is rendered as 'Sane si ad deitatis naturam spectes, non erras' in PG77, 1386D, and likewise A.J. Festugière, *Ephèse et Chalcédoine: actes* (1982), 268.

[324] ACO I 1/2, 73, 11-2.

[325] *Cf. Qērellos* 4.1, 50, 16-7; 51, footnote 56; PG77, 1390B; A.J. Festugière, *Ephèse et Chalcédoine: actes* (1982), 269.

[326] ACO I 1/2, 72, 6.

[327] H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 331.

[328] *Ibid.*, 283, M. Simonetti, 'Alcune osservazioni sul monofisismo di Cirillo' (1982), 496, 504.

[329] See L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 369-86, largely based on F. Loofs, *Leontius von Byzanz* (1887).

background in Athanasian doctrine did not hinder him, even by 428 at the latest, from adopting Gregory Nazianzen' Christology 'as the basic framework of his own thought, within which he could locate compatible motifs from Athanasius and others.'[330] Just as Theodotus' Homilies I and II,[331] this vocabulary could develop without a dialogue with Nestorius.[332]

John 1:14 is a key text on which Cyril develops his 'winning intuitive' Christological model.[333] When Theodotus cites the Scriptural passage at the end of Homily III,[334] he claims it expresses the Christian εὐσέβεια. It is part of the praise of John the Evangelist, within the homage to Ephesus. Theodotus commends the evangelist's brevity, whose teaching has conferred grace (χαρίζομαι). Brevity excuses Theodotus from expounding the Johannine passage at length. In the brief exegesis he offers, he employs his vocabulary of nature without qualifications. It is connected to the recapitulation of the Christology he exposes in the homily, just before the concluding formulaic doxology.[335] The recapitulation succinctly intertwines layered allusions, built around parallels (ὁ ὤν/flesh, being/becoming, nature/economy). Theodotus finds in ὁ ὤν alluding to *Ex.* 3:14 the parallel for the ὁ λόγος of *John* 1:14. After this substitution, Theodotus' exegesis of *John* 1:14 is an interpretation of the words: ὤν is seen verbally, and characterised by what pertains to the nature (again, unqualified); the becoming (ἐγένετο) which implies change and the human aspects of the incarnate one are justified by the economy. Theodotus is concerned with the Christological summary, which he tries to validate rhetorically by juxtaposition to the preceding biblical quotation of *John* 1:14 and especially to the subsequent doxology formula, as if by diffusion of their authority.

Homily III.4[336] is Theodotus' discussion of *Philippians* 2, a corner-stone text for Cyrillians and Nestorians alike. The exegesis of *Phil.* 2:5-7 motivated the frequent use of the vocabulary of lowness and servility to talk about the humanity and divinity of Christ.[337] Without attempting to trace the history of its Christological exegesis in the setting of the Council of Ephesus, some key examples are compared to Theodotus' exposition.

[330] C.A. Beeley, 'Cyril of Alexandria and Gregory Nazianzen' (2009), 417.

[331] See pp. 108ff.

[332] *Ibid.*, 416.

[333] A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben* (1979), 639; *cf.* S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004), 38-9, and H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 544.

[334] Theodotus' also mentions *John* 1:14 in Homily II, ACO I 1/2, 75, 24.

[335] A. Olivar, *La predicación* (1991), 524-5, W. Mayer, 'John Chrysostom' (1998), 117-8.

[336] ACO I 1/2, 72, 30 - 73, 9.

[337] The variety of expressions for low ranking workers and poverty, and the self-evident dependency of the slaves and the poor in relation to the masters echo the social structure of Ancyra and Greek late antiquity in general. See, however, R. MacMullen, 'The preacher's audience' (1989), 504-5.

Theodotus' Homily III.4 has many similarities to Cyril *Epistula* 1, 13-4.[338] Both authors ask their audience for the meaning of the text, and reprimand those who in doing so would be led to introduce divisions in Christ. Both dwell on the narrative of the 'descent to humiliation'[339] to explain 'how he was emptied',[340] and then present statements to claim that this does not contradict God's impassibility. While Cyril argues against the possibility that Christ was a mere man, saying that divinity was necessary so that an emptying could happen,[341] Theodotus is more worried with the manner of the self-emptying. These and other similarities[342] should be seen as evidence that Cyril's letter was the backdrop, the shared knowledge in which the Cyrillians were willing to talk to each other, rather than as specific allusions and emulations.

In the conciliar setting of the sermon, the bishops had perhaps recently heard Nestorius' answer to Cyril's second letter, and had explicitly condemned it. They had also been presented with a selection of objectionable things said by Nestorius. Both contain passages dealing with *Philippians* 2.[343] In Nestorius' exegesis in the *florilegium*, his paraphrase of *Phil.* 2:6-7a omits the clause about emptying. Theodotus, on the contrary, draws attention to κενόω. Addressing his interlocutor with 'Tell me the emptying of the only-begotten!',[344] Theodotus narrates the hymn in *Philippians* 2 about slavery, lowness, obedience, suffering, and death on the cross, without quoting any verse.

Neither the theme of self-emptying nor any direct allusion to this scriptural passage occur in Cyril's first two letters against Nestorius.[345] Only some elements of the hymn appear, in narrative fashion, emphasising the humanity and redemption brought about by Christ. Thus, the bishops probably had not heard a Cyrillian exegesis of *Philippians* 2 during the session of 22 June.

The structure of Theodotus' exegesis of *Phil.* 2:5ff. takes him from an invective against dividing conceptually (*e.g.* positing two things, when saying 'one'),

[338] *Coll. Vat.* 1, 13-4. ACO I 1/1, 16. *Cf.* ACO I 1/2, 95, 10-5.

[339] Cyril: ACO I 1/1, 16, 8.

[340] Theodotus: ACO I 1/2, 73, 10.

[341] ACO I 1/1, 16, 15-7.

[342] Like the insufficiency of the most pre-eminent man (Moses, as proven by the miracles he performed) to 'surpass the limitations of humanhood': ACO I 1/1, 20, 28 - 21, 20.

[343] Respectively, *Coll. Vat.* 5, 4 ACO I 1/1, 30, and *Coll. Vat.*, 60, 7 ACO I 1/2, 47, 16-22.

[344] Theodotus: ACO I 1/2, 73, 9-10.

[345] In the second letter to Nestorius, Cyril uses φύσις unqualified, for example in 'This does not mean that he underwent the experience of death in terms of *his nature* for it would be madness to say or think such a thing; rather, as I have said, it means that his flesh tasted death.' (ACO I 1/1, 27) 'He' refers to the λόγος of God, named several lines before, and the intervening phrases make it clear that Cyril means 'Christ', since only so does 'his flesh' on the next line make sense. See J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 264, and especially H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 331-2. The isolated instances can be explained from the context, see further, M. Simonetti, 'Alcune osservazioni sul monofisismo di Cirillo' (1982), 496.

as shall be discussed in the analysis of Theodotus' preaching against reasoning,[346] to an argument for the freedom of the self-emptying. It leads to a presentation of elements of the self-emptying which point to Christ's full humanity and divinity. The condemnation of *conceiving* separately in Christ a man and the λόγος is the content of Anathema 4,[347] by which Cyril condemns Nestorius' use of *Phil.* 2:5ff. It is unclear if everyone in Theodotus' conciliar audience knew the anathemata, since at least during the session of 22 June the third letter to Nestorius apparently was not read.[348] Those familiar with the letter may still have lacked the broader polemical use of the connection with this scriptural passage. Cyril makes an explicit link of Anathema 4 to an exegesis of *Phil.* 2:5ff. in *Explicatio duodecim capitum*[349] following a pattern similar to the passage from Theodotus' sermon just described. Cyril wrote this *Explicatio* while under house-arrest at Ephesus, in late summer 431, probably a while after Theodotus preached his sermon. Cyril's ideas or the way of expressing them were not all new, and Theodotus may have – at the earlier date – echoed Cyrillian ideas when so many similarities exist between his sermon and the *Explicatio*.[350] Cyril's treatise addresses topics like a *communicatio idiomatum*,[351] or that it is the πρόσωπον which ought not to be divided more directly than Theodotus.[352]

The emphasis on the freedom of Christ's lowering, or the impossibility of someone compelling him to become what human beings are if he 'was to shun human characteristics',[353] sheds light on Theodotus' hard-to-translate re-rendering of *Phil.* 2:6:

> he, who took freedom out of a booty, does not sustain anything servile, in order not to cause detriment to freedom.[354]

Theodotus seems to refer to a shared understanding of the ineffable freedom of God as a cause for him to freely become Christ, subject to the characteristics of a human being without being constrained by (i.e. sustaining) them. This points to an understanding of Anathema 4 that Cyril would then expound.[355] Theodotus' exegesis of *Phil.* 2:5ff. mentions often the φύσις involved in the

[346] See p. 184.

[347] *Coll. Vat.* 148, 13-4: ACO I 1/5, 19-20.

[348] ACO I 1/2, 36, 20-1. *Cf.* T. Graumann, 'Protokollierung, Aktenerstellung' (2010), 33, *id.*, *Die Kirche der Väter* (2002), 402, A. de Halleux, 'Les douze chapitres cyrilliens au concile' (1992), 425-6, 447ff.

[349] ACO I 1/5, 19, 22ff.

[350] See H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 271-8 on *De incarnatione* and *De recta fide ad Theodosium* (which he calls *Oratio ad Theodosium*).

[351] ACO I 1/5, 20, 3-6.

[352] ACO I 1/5, 20, 6-9.

[353] ACO I 1/5, 19, 27.

[354] ACO I 1/2, 73, 5-6.

[355] J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 234.

self-emptying, while Cyril's, in *Explicatio*, mentions φύσις but once, and remarkably only when referring to the 'nature of man',[356] perhaps because the next anathema focuses on φύσις.[357]

In Homily III.4, Theodotus' unqualified use of φύσις seems unremarkable at first sight. For example, 'he remained God according to his nature'[358] seems a reinforcement of 'he remained what he was',[359] which resembles in sound similar slogans and catch phrases.[360] However, Theodotus goes on to speak of 'by nature he was lord', and that 'not a passive nature [...] was appended to God', the lord 'holding the impassive nature'.[361] The passage does not clarify what Theodotus understood by the φύσις of or in something, especially by the φύσις in Christ. Taking his exegesis of *Philippians* 2 by the letter rather suggests he thought only one nature existed in Christ,[362] which was never qualified by a only-human attribute.

Three occurrences of τῇι οἰκείαι φύσει in Homily II shed some light on Theodotus' view of φύσις of the incarnate word of God. The passage directly concerned with the narrative of the economy presents problems for translation:

> For the only-begotten is said (to be) word, not uttered, but essential and enhypostatic, suffering nothing *in his own nature*, being an impassible word [...] has made the suffering of the nail-pierced one his own.[363]

τῇι οἰκείαι φύσει may refer to what is different between the nature of God or of the λόγος, and that of Christ, if οἰκεῖος is considered an allusion to the economy. Then, a possible translation of the dative would be 'through the incarnate nature', as if Theodotus had more explicitly employed οἰκονομικός.[364] However, οἰκεῖος often had the weakened sense of being equivalent to ἴδιος,[365] which leads to a few more interpretations of the expression. Depending on the interpretation of the dative, possible translations are 'suffering nothing *on account of his nature*' or '*in his (=divine) nature*'. A translation of οἰκείαι as equivalent to ἴδιος is supported by an earlier instance of τῇι οἰκείαι φύσει in Homily II. There it refers to the 'uttered word' of a king which 'in its own

[356] 'we attribute these sayings which are beyond *the nature of man* to one Christ and Son', ACO I 1/5, 20, 6.

[357] '[Christ] is truly God as the one natural (lit. also by nature) Son', ACO I 1/5, 20, 17-8.

[358] ACO I 1/2, 72, 9-10.

[359] ACO I 1/2, 72, 9.

[360] Echoing *Coll. Vat.* 1, 12: ACO I 1/1, 15, 25ff.

[361] ACO I 1/2, 73, 10-2.

[362] Theodotus' usage cannot be satisfactorily explained as 'common nature' because of the exegetical and polemical context of the passages. See H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 512-7.

[363] ACO I 1/2, 80, 16-7, 20.

[364] *Cf.* L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 320ff. See also H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 188 on 'to appropriate' (οἰκειοῦν).

[365] *Cf. ibid.*, 279.

nature' (τῇι οἰκείαι φύσει) is not affected by what befalls the paper or the elements on which it is written.[366]

The clearest indication that Theodotus' choice of vocabulary indeed alludes to the economy is the first occurrence of the expression in Homily II. When Theodotus begins to discuss the 'uttered word' as a 'model of what is set before us', he promises his interlocutor that he will 'show how [...] the untouched is touched, not altered *in his own nature*, but taking up a seen and touched shape.'[367] Strictly speaking, all the sentence refers to is the model which Theodotus will present, that is, the *word* of human discourse, but he clearly alludes to the *word* of God. It follows from the passage that since Theodotus only speaks of one φύσις in Christ, and that the *word* does not 'alter his own nature', Christ has indeed only one nature, namely the divine one.

The unqualified use of φύσις potentially highlights Christological questions, and translators have often supplied qualifications. Theodotus relied on the shared assumptions of his audience and the characteristics of the Greek language. The consistent use, however, suggests that he avoided the qualified expressions purposely. Rather than dismiss this usage of φύσις as ambiguous, it fits into Theodotus' criticism of a rational approach to divine matters. Theodotus did not oppose Cyril's theology, and his Christology was open to a Cyrillian reading. Theodotus may have been reticent of pinning down divine matters with too many words chosen by feeble human reasoning or a nuanced account of theological topics. Theodotus' homiletic output suggests he stepped away from Cyril's expressions and did not keep up with the lexical development after the council.

Wondrous economy, human reasoning and evil

Substantial aspects of Theodotus' Christology rely on his stance on human reasoning about matters of faith. He acknowledged reason and understanding can play a role in the relation of the faithful towards God, yet he did not hesitate to preach against reasoning. Theodotus dwells on the limitations of the human rational mind, especially in the opposition to miraculous and wonderful aspects of the economy. Occasionally, Theodotus expresses the importance of the 'wonderful' (τὸ θαυμαστόν, τὸ παράδοξον) as a requirement:

> He became a human being while the essence of God was not changed nor altered into another nature. For else that which came to be would not have been a wonder, if he had accepted another nature through a change of nature.[368]

The extraordinariness of Christ's suffering, and the wonderful display of his divine powers in wonders and miracles are exemplified by the pairs of allusions

[366] ACO I 1/2, 80, 13-4.
[367] ACO I 1/2, 76, 20-2.
[368] ACO I 1/2, 81, 34. Similarly, ACO I 1/2, 75, 27-9. Contrast *ibid.*, 398.

to events in the life of Christ at the end of Homily III,[369] where figures of sound and repeated syntactic structure provide features uniting first halves (i.e., what refers to the slave, that is, to human beings[370]) and second halves (i.e. what refers to the lord, God[371]). Additionally, Theodotus states at the end of the passage that 'what appeared was made believable by the sufferings, and the hidden one was shown by the wonders', and thus answers what he had said before ('Tell me the emptying of the only-begotten').[372]

This passage is a subdued sample of the rich images which accentuate the wonderful in the world in Theodotus' longer homilies.[373] When he concentrates on the 'supernatural' he frequently includes non-scriptural details, often in the framework of lengthy fictional excursus from biblical exegesis.[374] The passages are part of his defence of faith against reasoning, where the importance of the wonderful is a major argument.

Importance of the wonderful for the faithful

It has recently been claimed that Theodotus 'did think that the incarnation could be illustrated and its possibility explained by the turning of the Nile into blood.'[375] It is unlikely that this is an accurate presentation of Theodotus' Christology. Theodotus did not use such miracles as models of the theological conundrum at stake, rather, as models of their inaccessibility, and therefore conducive to the proper apprehension of matters of faith. He lists many wonderful deeds to express events which are out of the order of the world[376] as human beings know it. He chose miracles which involve a transformation (of one thing into something else) and which are accordingly relevant to the wider context of the text, and do not digress or even distract. Theodotus asks the faithful to see as wonders what scripture describes as wonder, and once they do this and acknowledge the wondrousness of such happenings, he demands them to accept the far greater wonder of all aspects of the economy, especially of the incarnation.[377]

Wonders are an essential part of the divine actions in the world,[378] including, before the incarnation, the miracles of the Old Testament. For Theodotus all

[369] ACO I 1/2, 73, 14-9.

[370] Showing the form of a slave, hungering as one, toiling and shrinking from the cross as a human being.

[371] Act well, confer grace, do wonders exemplified by the multiplication of bread, the walking on the sea.

[372] ACO I 1/2, 73, 9-10. *Cf. ibid.*, 365.

[373] For example, PG77, 1393BC, describing Christ's begetting, before asking τί θαυμάσωμεν;

[374] See p. 102.

[375] Cited on p. 173. Compare *ibid.*, 368.

[376] παράδοξος δὲ ὅτι τὸν τῆς φύσεως λόγον ἐνίκησε, ACO I 1/2, 80, 34.

[377] ACO I 1/2, 85, 1-10.

[378] *Cf. ibid.*, 293, 303; N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 64.

'supernatural' divine interventions ought to remain as wonders to fulfil their intended role. God meant them to be beyond human reason, and thus they should remain. Therefore, the magi are a model for the Christians, 'having believed the star and not having been curious about nature. The gentile accept wonders by belief', and Theodotus attacks those who 'disbelieve, relying on human reasoning'.[379] Homily V, a nativity festal homily, can be seen as a praise of the unbelievability (παράδοξος) of the economy and several of its aspects. Theodotus frequently employs τὸ παράδοξον, an expression apparently used more by Antiochene and Oriental writers than Cyrillians.[380] He argues that several (or even all) aspects of Christ's life including his birth, had to be wondrous and miraculous since the economy is ineffable.[381]

Theodotus repeatedly said that faith needs wonders,[382] although he granted that wonders are not enough on their own.[383] In the late antique context, miracles – in hagiography or from personal experience – were seen to be the ultimate standard by which holy men, bishops *et al.* were ranked.[384] The cherishing of mysteries for their own sake, as something that makes religion and faith more dear, is also found in other homilies in conciliar collections,[385] and may reflect a social need for miracles, likewise answered, for example, by theurgy, which contributed to the popularity of Neoplatonism.[386] As in Christianity, the fundamental features and concepts of its systems of thought centred around immaterial aspects, but it developed elements to answer a craving for concrete (or at least visible) miracles. Although there were material facets central for the Christian faith, for example in some of the sacraments, it incorporated alternative answers to the yearn for the spectacular, involving the concrete world around mankind.[387]

'Against reasoning' and the exegesis of Phil. 2:5-11

The importance of the wonderful, the centrality of faith being received and accepted are some of Theodotus' motivations to preach against reasoning. In

[379] ACO I 1/2, 83, 24-5.

[380] See the entry in G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (1961). See also S. Gerber, *Theodor von Mopsuestia und das Nicänum* (2000), 162-3.

[381] *E.g.* Homily V.4, M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 227, IV, 1-2.

[382] Especially, ACO I 1/2, 76, 4-5.

[383] M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 230, 25-8.

[384] C. Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity* (2005), 160-4.

[385] For example, *Qērellos* 4.1, 65, 107.

[386] E.J. Watts, *City and School* (2006), 88-9.

[387] However, positing this social picture may reflect an oversimplification of the mindset of the early fifth century that echoes theories of late antique decadence in a model which posits a progression towards abstraction, as if this scheme is globally valid particularly in this period. R. MacMullen, *Voting about God* (2006), 45-55, 116. Other examples of use of miracles as proof of the veracity of the faith in A. Kofsky, *Eusebius of Caesarea* (2000), 172ff.

a few instances in Homilies III and VI, Theodotus' deliberate stance against reasoning on matters of faith comes through.[388] Lengthier passages in Homilies I and II, on similar topics, make more apparent the negative connotations in his way of speaking about human understanding. There, he describes the limitations of the human mind, wherefore God is unattainable to human reasoning:

He came into his own (ἴδια), he says, and his own did not receive him (*John* 1:11), but rather he was in the world and the world came to be through him, and the world did not know him (*John* 1:10). But the ignorance (ἄγνοια) iself is not of the category[389] of the human beings. For God is unattainable by human reasoning because of the divinity[390] of (his) nature; for it is not natural for the mind of human beings to look down on him. The divine nature escapes from the mind of human beings; it is loftier than our reasoning (λογισμῶν).[391]

Since wonders are central to Theodotus' understanding of faith, if men, with their understanding, could grasp them, not only would they stop being effective,[392] but a part of the faith would also be damaged:

If the unreachable of the word[393] were accessible to us, *it would not be a wonder, but a matter according to nature*; but if what has come to be is a wonder and a sign, it yields the word to the wonder working lord.[394]

Reason could 'destroy' the miracles. It is an argument in Theodotus' and Cyril's interpretation of Nestorius' approach to Christology, for example, concerning wonders related to the incarnation.[395]

Theodotus criticised the vocabulary of no philosophical school in particular whilst speaking against human reasoning.[396] Human reason as such, being God

[388] *E.g.* ACO I 1/2, 72, 21, 33-5; *Qērellos* 4.1, 130, 10. *Cf.* S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004), 65.

[389] As what can be predicated of something, this was standard logic vocabulary, especially Aristotelian logic. *Cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 103-8, 122.

[390] As a logical argument, equivalent to 'a white thing is bright because of its whiteness', the use of the causal sentence adds little, since unattainability is part of the divine attributes, however the redundancy associates God's ineffability to his nature and thus contributes to Christological arguments on Christ's divine nature.

[391] ACO I 1/2, 74, 5-10. *Cf. ibid.*, 64.

[392] ACO I 1/2, 89, 32-3.

[393] λόγος.

[394] ACO I 1/2, 75, 26-7. The highlighted passage summarises Theodotus' sharp criticism: οὐκ ἦν θαῦμα, ἀλλὰ κατὰ φύσιν πρᾶγμα· (l.26).

[395] See below on the criticism of conceptual divisions. *Cf.* L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 283ff.

[396] The occurrence of what may now seem technical vocabulary related to one or other philosophical school can at best suggest that Theodotus received a good education and had an audience with a similar erudition, which would understand his meaning without focusing on those words.

given (in creation) is not evil[397] – rather, limited[398] – but Theodotus considers it unable to know its limitations, and thus prone to interfere with faith matters, and the foundations of faith.[399] Nevertheless, human faculties could be used for theological purposes. For example, Theodotus criticises the enemies of the faith for not *recognising* the incarnation.[400] This recognition is an intellectual apprehension of the theology behind the scriptural narratives, not of these themselves. A failure to recognise the incarnation was one of the things being imputed against Nestorius and those who shared his 'unorthodox' Christological views, or defended him. Theodotus wishes to preclude that the Son be estranged from God,[401] or that, concerning Christ, what is human and divine be separated too much by reasoning.[402] Frequently, Theodotus relates this to envisaging a change of natures,[403] or a refusal to attribute human passions, weaknesses and (hence) mutability to Christ,[404] and seems to be still employing arguments reminiscent of the Arian debate.[405]

Christians ought to strive to obtain a proper understanding of theological matters. The point of dissension are the possible and preferable ways to obtain it. Such valuation of the means towards theological understanding is balanced with the dangers of being led to mistaken apprehensions on questions pertaining to the faith. Christian writers thought disapprovingly of certain attempts in these directions, considering humans prone to error in all their endeavours. In this, they shared ideas of Hellenistic and Jewish thought. Theodotus' critical, highly negative view of reasoning, echoed a common topic in Greek patristics, exemplified by some writings of John Chrysostom.[406] Questioning and inquiring into a theological matter would too often lead to mistaken understanding. An incorrect apprehension of a topic can be passed on in teaching and is more difficult to be put aside than the awareness of not understanding something. This seems to have been one of the implicit motivations for church fathers to criticise reasoning about theological mysteries,[407] and to try to regulate theological instruction.[408]

[397] Praise of man created by God: ACO I 1/2, 78, 14-7.

[398] ACO I 1/2, 83, 21-3, 74, 8-12. *Cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 370.

[399] Praise of man created by God: ACO I 1/2, 82, 16-8.

[400] *Qērellos* 4.1, 124, 2.

[401] ACO I 1/2, 74, 14.

[402] ACO I 1/2, 89, 30-3.

[403] ACO I 1/2, 82, 22-3.

[404] ACO I 1/2, 83, 5ff.

[405] *Cf.* S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004), 137 and S. Gerber, *Theodor von Mopsuestia und das Nicänum* (2000), 196-8.

[406] See J.LR. Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication* (2006), 90, 115 for specific examples and a wider discussion.

[407] *Cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 265, 292.

[408] For example, reciprocal excommunications, such as befell Theodotus (ACO I 4, 80, 16-7).

Theodotus states the logic for his attack against reasoning in the final exhortations of Homily I:

Do not dissolve the wonder, being eager to find the reason; for the wonder which reason makes known, does not remain. If the reason of what came to be is well-known, the fact is no longer a sign nor a wonder; and if it is sign and wonder, leaving behind the reasonings, recover the belief.[409]

Theodotus' main concern is with the splitting and dividing, which leads to separation in words or concepts, because if applied to understanding Christ, the union is denied.[410] It seems that for him this mental process was such an essential part of any human reasoning that he would rather speak against any reasoning, than advocate an approach to the divine mysteries that would (somehow) not involve an intellectual dividing, and still aid human beings in their way towards God. If he could imagine another way of thinking, he held back from instructing his audience to adopt it and abandon what they were used to and had perhaps been trained to do.[411]

'Only conceptually'

In Homily I,[412] Theodotus states the grounds of his objections against what can be described as to 'separate through reflection what had been joined', saying that the 'concept would become false, having separated what had always been joined'. Theodotus defends an agreement of concept and reason (λόγος). Therefore, if, for example, someone says something is one, he ought to think a single one (ἕνα).[413]

Theodotus expresses his wish that the audience engage in the exegesis of *Philippians* 2 by modifying the biblical text, adding 'each', and therefore changing φρονέω to third person singular.[414] Thus he addresses the audience collectively by Paul's words. A proper Christology is reflected in what is 'considered in Christ Jesus', and *Phil.* 2:6 is the answer to *Phil.* 2:5.[415] Theodotus raises contrasting challenges against the dividing in the mind, expressed by

[409] ACO I 1/2, 89, 32-4.

[410] *Cf.* ACO I 1/2, 89, 30, and next paragraph.

[411] Bisections, antipodes and *sic et non* arguments had an important role in the late antique educational system. The analogy of the divided line (Plato, *Rep.* VI 509D-13E) may be suggestive of the importance of bisection in many philosophical schools, not to mention the approach to language and discourse of grammar and rhetoric, respectively. See also P. Gemeinhardt, *Das lateinische Christentum und die antike pagane Bildung* (2007), 398-9.

[412] ACO I 1/2, 89, 20-30.

[413] ACO I 1/2, 89, 26-7. *Cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 267.

[414] ACO I 1/2, 73, 1. It is the most significant alteration of a scriptural reading in Theodotus' conciliar homilies.

[415] ACO I 1/2, 73, 4.

the references to 'dividing' (ὁ διαιρῶν), 'supposing' (ὑποτιθέμενος), 'positing' (κειμένων).[416]

Theodotus' exegesis of *Phil.* 2:5ff. involves the polemic concerning the names of the incarnate one: Christ, Jesus, Emmanuel, and combinations thereof. Stating 'There he says Jesus', Theodotus argues that Paul is deliberately emphasising Jesus, while Nestorius would say in such circumstances something like 'Paul says Christ Jesus',[417] and dwell on the use of Christ there.[418] Theodotus, on the other hand, omits Christ when speaking about the name. Before addressing Christ's 'self-emptying' (*Phil.* 2:6ff.), Theodotus draws on *Luke* 1:31,[419] as another scriptural passage which roots the human links of both the names (the 'appellation') and the person (the human person, and as such related to the fact of having been born of Mary, the 'mother'). 'This one, the seen one (τὸν ὁρώμενον)' receives a name, just as every man.[420]

Early in the Christological debate, Cyril linked the discussion about the names to the introduction of divisions into Christ.[421] He insisted on this approach, epitomised in Anathema 4,[422] regardless of Nestorius' protests of preserving the unity, who claimed to be distinguishing only conceptually.[423]

For Theodotus, no thinking about the human and the divine in Christ would not deny the reality of the incarnation.[424] He was more uncompromising than Cyril, who would accept a subtle purely conceptual apprehension of the divine and human in Christ with the imagination of the intellect.[425] In *Epistula* 46, Cyril also draws a parallel to the human being composed of body and soul,[426] which is only distinguished conceptually.[427] Some Cyrillians objected that so

[416] ACO I 1/2, 72, 33-4.

[417] ACO I 1/2, 72, 32. *Cf.* L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 140ff.

[418] See *Coll. Vat.* 5, 3-4 ACO I 1/1, 29-30, *cf.* J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 366.

[419] ACO I 1/2, 72, 32-3.

[420] ACO I 1/2, 73, 2-3.

[421] *Coll. Vat.* 1, 13-4, ACO I 1/1, 16.

[422] See p. 177, H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 392.

[423] ACO I 1/1, 30, 2-7. Also later in the *Heracl.* he addressed the ineffability of the self-emptying (*Phil.* 2:6), and insisted that Christ was 'indivisible as one single being', but also that 'the λόγος took the form of a slave (*Phil.* 2:7) for his πρόσωπον, but not for his nature' in view of what has been described as the language barrier of the Christological discussion. See F. Nau (ed.), *Le Livre d'Héraclide de Damas* (1910), 67, 152. See also J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 162-72.

[424] ACO I 1/2, 89, 32 - 90, 3.

[425] ἐν ψιλαῖς διελόντες ἐννοίαις καὶ ὡς ἐν ἰσχναῖς θεωρίαις ἤτοι νοῦ φαντασίαις τὴν διαφορὰν δεξάμενοι, ACO I 1/6, 162, 6-7. Cyril accepted, even referred to a conceptual distinction between the natures; *cf.* M. Simonetti, 'Alcune osservazioni sul monofisismo di Cirillo' (1982), 493, 510. Theodotus, however, objected to conceptual distinction between 'two', in the masculine gender, open to being read as referring to two 'persons'. Therefore his view was never considered an open challenge for Cyril, as shown by the 'monophysite' sources which cite him while being adamantly pro-Cyrillian.

[426] F.M. Young, 'A reconsideration of Alexandrian Christology' (1971), 105-6.

[427] ACO I 1/6, 162, 15ff. *Cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 245.

much distinction ought not to be drawn in Christ, even in a 'two natures and one person' pattern as suggested by the level of separation between body and soul in the human being.[428] Nestorius too saw in the parallel shortcomings of Cyril's union according to the hypostasis.[429]

In Homily III.4, Theodotus attempts to draw out the extremes to which ideas about the conceptual positing of two 'somethings' in Christ can be bent via the accumulation of questions addressed either to the fictional interlocutor or the audience. These questions imply the ridiculousness and unfittingness of this approach. Theodotus uses the context of *Philippians* 2[430] to put in parallel a few pairs where the difference between the human and the divine are highlighted: slave/lord, suffering/not-suffering. When interrogating his fictional interlocutor about the advantage (ὄνησις) of all this theologising, Theodotus refers to what is being posited (κεῖμαι) using πρᾶγμα.[431] Theodotus not only questions the usefulness of stipulating πράγματα, but he is about to condemn those who think about two πράγματα in Christ. Although πρᾶγμα could be used technically in religious texts of this time,[432] Theodotus apparently employs it quite colloquially, equivalent to the contemporary use of 'thing', and not as incorporeals, in opposition to σῶμα, for example. Theodotus seems aware of ongoing conflicts of adopted terminologies.[433] Choosing to allude to 'what is in Christ' as πράγματα frees him from employing any highly charged technical word (nature, being, existence).[434] πρᾶγμα is not another option, but Theodotus' way to speak of the error of others without the error crossing his lips.

Theodotus perhaps drew on the authority of Cyril, whom he praises for his teaching, with echoes of vocabulary and arguments from Cyril's exegesis of

[428] Cyril explained the parallel in letters to Acacius, Succensus, Eulogius, *etc.* See *ibid.*, 537-43, especially 540. See also G.L. Castro, *Cirillo di Alessandria: Epistole cristologiche* (1999), 160 on ACO I 1/3, 92, 9-12 about Cyril' concession of a distinction in thought of the hypostases. Theodotus' generalising stance against reasoning suggests that he would discourage even this distinction.

[429] See H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 526-7, L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 137.

[430] See in D. Keating, 'Christology in Cyril and Leo' (2010), 53, 55 how the vocabulary of the exegesis of *Phil.* 2:6-7 exemplifies the similarities and conflicts of Leo's and Cyril's Christology. While Cyril, like Theodotus, used phrases without a noun for what is human and divine in Christ, Leo's use of Paul's *forma* was central to making passages of his *Tomus* (*e.g.* ACO I 1/1, 14-5.) 'unbearable' for Easterners. In spite of having received a Latin version of Cyril's *Schol. inc.*, Celestine focused on the question of duality, which had been at the centre of the exegesis by Theodotus, Nestorius and the Cyril of the *Explicatio* of Anathema 4. See J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 294.

[431] ACO I 1/2, 73, 1. *Cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 319.

[432] Entry in G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (1961), and P. Hadot, 'Sur divers sens du mot PRAGMA' (1980).

[433] *Cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 194ff.

[434] Perhaps akin to his stance on the use of φύσις. See p. 179, and M. Simonetti, 'Alcune osservazioni sul monofisismo di Cirillo' (1982), 496.

Philippians 2 in *Epistula* 1,[435] which his audience probably knew. The emulation seems an attempt to surpass it rather than of homage. The rhythm of the frequent repetition of *Phil.* 2:5 in Homily III draws attention to the verse from scripture, and highlights its argumentative importance.[436] It is the scriptural passage which, if correctly understood, should be a guide for a proper mastery of Christology. The focus on the verse helps Theodotus to draw the authority of scripture to his exegesis. The aim of the preaching theologian is that all Christians settle on a 'right' view and hold it. Theodotus instantiates this when asking the audience what understanding of Christ they have.[437] Questioning the assumptions of the audience prepares the exegesis of the remainder of *Philippians* 2 with a warning against approaching the subject of Christology with too much of their rational understanding, and against venturing to bring into a discourse any conceptual twofoldness.[438]

The discussion about the shortcomings of the excuse of doing things 'only conceptually' is present on both sides of the Christological debate, but is not as predominant an argument as in Theodotus' homilies before the council.[439] Perhaps, in Ancyra it was a particularly relevant theme. Theodotus' audience may have identified or admitted a tendency to rationalise, especially if the congregation was worried about being led astray by their thoughts, or by the digressions of others urging for reflection on theological topics. The argument was then applicable to Nestorius, as a particularly acute example of 'bad' influence.

In the fifth century, fewer theologians were engaging with the philosophical and cosmological implications of religious and logical formulations than in the fourth century.[440] They claimed to put such questions aside in their own theological exploits, and advocated that others do so. Avoidance of reasoning is a significant trait of Cyril's works,[441] and from his many works and the quite

[435] ACO I 1/1, 16.

[436] *E.g.* Cyril's extensive quotation in *Expl. xii cap.* (ACO I 1/5, 19, 22ff.),and in *Schol. inc.*, 12, P.E. Pusey (ed.), *Cyrilli Epistolae* (1875), 524, to argue against Christ as a 'mere' man, and not to answer to Nestorian usage of the passage with the emphasis on the reality of Christ.

[437] ACO I 1/2, 73, 4. The gnomic use of the aorist ἐφρονήσαμεν refers not to the past, but to the constant and age-encompassing God-given faith.

[438] See p. 172, *cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 370.

[439] *Cf.* S. Wessel, 'Nestorius, Mary and controversy' (1999), 12f.

[440] *E.g.* Greg. Naz. *Or.* 26.9.

[441] H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 354, M. Simonetti, 'Alcune osservazioni sul monofisismo di Cirillo' (1982), 500ff. Exemplified by the criticism against too much curiosity and reasoning in *Dial. trin.* 3, 466a – G.-M. de Durand (ed.), *Cyrille d'Alexandrie. Dialogues sur la Trinité* (1976-8) 2. See M.-O. Boulnois, 'The mystery of the Trinity according to Cyril of Alexandria' (2003), 80. In a treatise, Cyril could balance the argument by allowing a search for the 'correct understanding': 'As long as theological research keeps within these limits, it does not spring from idle curiosity, but is life-giving, since "the nourishment of minds is true, faultless knowledge [...]" (*Glaphyra Ex.* II.3: PG69, 456d-457a)'; *cf.* M.-O. Boulnois, 'The mystery of the Trinity according to Cyril of Alexandria' (2003), 82-3. Limits within which human reason could search on all matters were often the smallest restriction posited by theologians from

detailed information on the problems he faced, it is possible to correlate his worries on '[s]uch speculation' to what he saw in Origenist thinkers.[442] Also Nestorius claimed to be dealing with some who pursue a λογομαχία. He condemned their efforts and instead praised 'popular παραίνεσις'. He may have preached regularly against resorting to reason.[443]

Regardless of the difficulty of the problems and the effort to solve them, bishops readily criticised who reached conclusions apparently in conflict with the faith of the church. They claimed it would be better not to have elite thinkers, who worry about difficult questions, and would not count themselves among them.[444] They advanced the argument that in the new world-order of Christianity, rational inquiry would no longer be necessary, in contrast with a pre-Christ's-coming world, where philosophical inquiry had a natural place.[445] They attacked Classicism as a whole, and avoided systematic discussion of intellectual processes[446] that could identify specific issues or the inappropriate use of concepts and ideas. Theodotus' criticism is not aimed at those practising philosophy 'for its own sake' (*e.g.* in the schools), but at those who mix it carelessly with matters of religion. Occasionally, Theodotus' arguments against human reasoning lead him to express widespread condemnation of any philosophising,[447] but the context points to a rather non-judicious focus on condemning any rational arguments on theological topics.[448] Resorting to reasoning causes belief to be neglected, without which matters of faith (*e.g.* those concerning God and his mysteries) are not approachable properly, as Theodotus expresses in a visually rich passage:

> For having delivered yourself to reasonings and having left behind faith exactly as a steadfast ship, and willing to penetrate in your searches the sea of God's signs, you shipwreck perforce.[449]

the fifth century onwards, especially by those of monastic extraction. See A.H. Becker, *Fear of God and the Beginning of Wisdom* (2006), 15-6.

[442] J.J. O'Keefe, 'Incorruption, anti-Origenism' (2003), 195, E.A. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy* (1992), 43ff.

[443] L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 66.

[444] *E.g.* M. Laird, *Gregory of Nyssa and the Grasp of Faith* (2004), 36.

[445] *E.g.* E.J. Watts, *City and School* (2006), 158-9, J.LR. Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication* (2006), 17. *Cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 504.

[446] *E.g.* M. Laird, *Gregory of Nyssa and the Grasp of Faith* (2004), 34-40. *Cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 533, L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 283ff.

[447] ACO I 1/2, 82, 16-8.

[448] ACO I 1/2, 82, 16-8, and, concerning Christology, ACO I 1/2, 89, 28 - 90, 2.

[449] M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 226, II, 3-6. Sea travelling was not part of Ancyran daily life, but the familiar topos of travel by sea is specified because it implied leaving safety and stability behind, demonstrating moral strength and physical and intellectual courage. See A.P. Kazhdan and G. Constable, *People and Power* (1982); C. Galatariotou, 'Travel and perception' (1993), 226; G.T. Dennis, 'Perils of the deep' (2001); L. Brubaker, 'The conquest of space' (2002), 247-8; and also M.E. Mullett, 'In peril on the sea' (2002). *Cf.* S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004), 210.

The attack on dependence on reason and nature was as much against philosophers as against heretics, who often were described as being led astray by following reason instead of faith. Theodotus' Hellenism[450] is most obvious in his labelling of those who pursue the condemnable use of λογισμοί with the Greeks of *1Cor.* 1:23.[451] Theodotus' use of this verse shows his positive appraisal of human rationality, since he suggests that only Christians deserve to be called λόγικοι, while Jews are the most unknowing (ἀγνωμονέστεροι) among the ἄλογοι men, although, for example, Christ becomes (eucharistic) nourishment for both λόγικοι and ἄλογοι.[452]

In Theodotus' works, λογισμοί means reasoning,[453] or closely related ideas from the semantic field of λόγος, whose manifold senses Theodotus explores more freely.[454] Λογισμοί always carry a negative sense that can be seen in the qualificatives or at least from the context. Therefore, the word may have been reminiscent of Evagrian' ideas[455] for Theodotus' audience. However, the meaning is quite different. Theodotus' λογισμοί are not a quasi synonym for the demons that plague those who are on the monastic path,[456] or an allusion to the capital sins.[457] Furthermore, even if Evagrius' λογισμοί can generally be translated as thoughts or considerations, they seldom imply the use of reason.[458]

[450] See p. 104 for its place in heresiological lists. Also, J. Kecskeméti, 'Doctrine et drame' (1993), 54-7.

[451] ACO I 1/2, 82, 12-32.

[452] ACO I 1/2, 86, 17, 22.

[453] He uses it encompassing deviating and erroneous approaches (*i.e.* mostly intellectual activity or things involving the mind, possibly those presupposing reason as such) as related to the perception of the divine, particularly as revealed in the scriptures, but also of the divine that is part of the life of a faithful. It echoes the traditional critique of (bad) rhetoric, of word-chopping and of protracting and convoluted arguments.

[454] For example, comparing Theodotus' Homily I and Proclus' Homily IV, which have extremely similar initial paragraphs, while in N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 226, Proclus employs νόμος (law) to say that the incarnation goes against the 'laws' of nature (which have actually been established by God himself), Theodotus consistently uses λόγος for these laws/reasons (ACO I 1/2, 80, 34). Thereby he means rules which men are more used to, and may understand. The incarnation breaks the 'laws' of nature, in so far as they are what humans describe nature with, and therefore Theodotus can say that λογισμοί are useless.

[455] K. Corrigan, *Evagrius and Gregory* (2009), 78-81. Also P. Géhin *et al.* (eds), *Evagre le Pontique. Sur les pensées* (1998), 27-8 on the meanings of λογισμός for church fathers, expanding the initial discussion in A. Guillaumont and C. Guillaumont (eds), *Evagre le Pontique* (1971), 56-63, or A.D. Rich, *Discernment in the Desert Fathers* (2007).

[456] They distract the monk from reaching a state where he may endeavour to fulfil the proximity to the divine.

[457] With this meaning, λογισμοί is still used in several religious denominations. Its common Latin translations is *uitia*, *e.g.* in the rendering of Cassian the Sabaite. *Cf. Inst. coen.* V 1, M. Petschenig (ed.), *Iohannis Cassiani* (1888), 81. See also P. Tzamalikos, *The Real Cassian Revisited* (2012), 124-6, 182.

[458] The two negative meanings of λογισμοί, that is, word-chopping and evil thoughts, are seldom if ever treated jointly by fourth and fifth-century authors, whether monastic or not. Neither

Theodotus' expressions have at least a lingering association with λόγος and λογομαχία. Nevertheless, the reproaching mention of λογισμοί may have led those familiar with concepts spreading together with monasticism, especially monks themselves, to interpret it accordingly. The faith versus reason debate had also influenced Evagrius' evolving use of the term, and with appropriate qualifications he occasionally used λογισμόν as an intellectual process involving reason.[459] Those acquainted with the Evagrian terminology may have been more affected by Theodotus' arguments when he referred to the problems which can be brought about by λογισμοί, or to the devil as a driving force of damaging intellectual processes and active in the present, as discussed in the next topic.

Bishops at councils were perhaps aware of the sort of lack of clarity on theological issues which has been levelled against them with hindsight.[460] The digressions in Homilies I and II on 'refrain from reasoning' may have appealed to the bishops not only as Christological arguments but also as guidelines for the theological debate.[461] The appeal of Theodotus' works beyond the Christological debate was helped by the stance against reasoning in theology which gained momentum in the East.[462] Perusal of the faith was not encouraged, and a better understanding of the divine mysteries was not seen as necessary or even useful for a growth in faith. What are called or considered mysteries ought to be kept as such.[463] Theodotus' approach may be justified considering the

are the extreme meanings connected. The very wide range of semantic fields linked to λόγος was not problematised, rather, its plurality of meanings was often exploited.

[459] P. Géhin *et al.* (eds), *Evagre le Pontique. Sur les pensées* (1998), 18, 9 are enlightening remarks with respect to Evagrius' works warranting that λογισμοί are not something bad on their own, *e.g. Peri logismon* 8.

[460] Concerning theological understanding, the following criticism of later events can be applied to the schematic presentation of Cyril's and the Oriental's thought during Ephesus 431 in view of the Formula of Reunion of 433: 'in fact there existed probably very few contemporaries who were able immediately to recognize that Eutyches's restoration meant a doctrinal aberration, as it was termed two years later.' E. Honigmann, 'Juvenal of Jerusalem' (1950), 237.

[461] Although the conciliar homilies contain passages on themes which Theodotus characterised in earlier homilies as consequences of dismantling miracles with human reason, the arguments against reason are rare and brief in them, for example, *Qērellos* 4.1, 130, 10ff.

[462] For example, in the Ethiopian church. Several text in the *Qērellos* collection digress on the insistence against reasoning, echoing Theodotus' arguments. Severus of Synada expresses in his homily a clear opposition to attempts to elucidate matters related to faith, as a way to 'play safe': *Qērellos* 4.1, 67. *E.g.* decrees against 'disputes' about religious questions already settled in synods, like ACO II 1/3, 119-121[478-480] – see E. Honigmann, 'Juvenal of Jerusalem' (1950), 251 – although imperial decrees could have limited influence.

[463] When approaching theological questions, earlier generations rather said that despite the inevitable failure to grasp by reason the mysteries, the individual could grow in faith by dwelling on them with whatever human faculty God gave. See M. Laird, Gregory of Nyssa *and the Grasp of Faith* (2004), 22. This also contrasts with the rigourous exploration of possibilities in Abelard *Logica ingredientibus*, B. Geyer (ed.), *Peter Abaelards philosophische Schriften* (1919), 26, 11-15; 28, 25-7; see also P.V. Spade, *Five Texts on the Mediaeval Problem of Universals* (1994), 49, 52.

absence of a religious educational system.[464] In order to promote the acceptance of the conciliar decisions, it was best to keep people (including bishops!) from looking too much at Nestorius' and Nestorian works, lest they were not able to distinguish what is orthodox insofar as it falls outside the conciliar endorsed anathemata and the views of those condemned; lest they had difficulties in refraining from following what was actually anathematised, and perhaps even believed in it. Preaching against deep understanding of theological matters caused collateral damage: doubts and problems did not stop surfacing, and those refraining from reflection and reasoning, found it increasingly difficult to see the issues at stake.

Theodotus' stance 'against reasoning' lays blame on most attempts to reach a proper (theological) understanding on one's own. The alternative which Theodotus preached was – of course – faith, but also to acknowledge the received teaching and accept the authority of the church, its bishops and preachers.[465] This authority is not subject to the same criticism because it does not rely (only) on human values or merits, rather, it relates to sacramental aspects. In order to appreciate the importance which Theodotus placed on bishops fulfilling their daily duties of preaching and administering sacraments, and the rationale of Theodotus' demands that they be steadfast in a sound theology to do so, it is necessary to present Theodotus' view of the evil in the world. He phrased it in often elaborate references to the devil, to envy and to evil in general.

The evil in the world

For Theodotus, the devil and similar demonic forces were indeed agents in the present moment, influencing the lives of people and the events in the world.[466] Theodotus' personified references to the devil would have further layers of meaning for those familiar with monasticism.[467] He echoed the recurrent theme in ascetic and monastic literature[468] of the faithful not only having to keep passively the faith, but also fight off actively the attack of demons.[469]

Theodotus personified evil or mentioned the devil when recreating biblical narratives even where scripture does not mention it.[470] Some allusions are loose, for example, the description of a flight of the devil as a consequence of

[464] See p. 38.

[465] *Cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 503.

[466] *Cf.* M. Ludlow, 'Demons, Evil, and Liminality' (2012), 181-2, S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004), 29.

[467] See remarks in L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 36, 152. Also K. Corrigan, *Evagrius and Gregory* (2009), 72-5, 93-7.

[468] *E.g.* P. Géhin *et al.* (eds), *Evagre le Pontique. Sur les pensées* (1998), 217-23. See D. Brakke, *Demons and the Making of the Monk* (2006), 106ff., 147-50.

[469] *E.g.* Homily VI.2: *Qērellos* 4.1, 124, 5ff.

[470] Homily V.4, 15-20, Homily VI.2. See p. 160.

the flight into Egypt.[471] The incarnation drives the devil into loss and flight.[472] The child flees into Egypt, and later Jesus retreats into the desert, and there he explicitly puts the devil to flight.[473] The generic desert was easily equated with the desolate areas preferred by monks and ascetics, among whom Egyptian holy men were particularly esteemed. They were renowned for putting the devil to flight, and the narratives mentioned often that they did so by reflecting on the hardships Jesus faced. Similarly, the bishops, many of whom lived as or among monks at one point in their lives,[474] did the same, both in preaching and in the decisions they took in their dioceses and during synods. The flight into Egypt which happened at one point in the past was part of that event by which human beings, particularly the church members, could face and put the devil to flight.

Theodotus described envy as a central motivation for heresy. Envy of the inequality of rank inherent to the creation of man (*Gen.* 1:26-8) was described as the cause for the snake's treachery, whereby it turned against the good deeds of God.[475] Since heresy is also seen as a denial of God's philanthropy, Theodotus put envy as its motivation.[476] Just as the snake had brought about the fall, and effected the end of the paradisiacal existence of mankind (which only the incarnation could redeem), so too those who spread heretical views about the incarnation were undoing God's perfecting deed towards men. If envy is the motivation, the ensuing actions (that is, the unorthodox claims) are deliberately aimed at destroying what gives mankind salvation. The logic of this analogy is not particularly clear. It seems that since 'God had united himself to the human being', this implies a higher (deified) state of the human, at least for those who hold the (orthodox) faith (so that they are saved). They can therefore be likened to the human beings in the Genesis account, placed above the rest of the creation.[477] In *Genesis* 3 the snake brings mischief about by persuasion

[471] It probably reflects some of the extensive apocryphal narratives related to the flight into Egypt. They are among the earliest and best developed stories whose theological details the church rarely cared to address, while also seldom condemning the devotional practices linked to it. See L. Valensi, *La fuite en Égypte* (2002), 22ff.

[472] *Revelation* 12.

[473] *Cf. Matt.* 4:1-11; *Mark* 1:12-5; *Luke* 4:1-13.

[474] Evidence, especially statistical, for the early fifth century is very sparse. See A. Sterk, *Renouncing the World yet Leading the Church* (2004), 180ff. for a discussion on how and why what were good examples and cases (of bishops who were or had been monks) slowly became the norm. It also becomes apparent that before the Justinian period this pattern was surely not a widespread norm (although the available data hinders conclusive generalisations) nor expected.

[475] The Christian tradition on the account of the fall dwelt vividly on increasingly narrative details, in part developing what was already present in Hellenistic Judaism (as exemplified in *Vita Adae et Evae*, Josephus and the Talmud). *Cf.* Cyril *Ep.* 39, ACO I 1/4, 16, 10.

[476] Homily VI.5: *Qērellos* 4.1, 130, 12ff.

[477] Envy is further explored in ACO I 1/2, 72, 23ff. Theodotus anchors the plot of the devil in both *Gen.* 3:1 and *Rev.* 12:4 to speak of the contrivances against orthodox faith. See also M. Ludlow, 'Demons, Evil, and Liminality' (2012), 196-7 on Gregory Nazianzen.

via a discourse which relies on syllogistic argumentation.[478] It is deception brought about by words,[479] in a dialogue where the snake has greater knowledge and mischievously instructs Eve. Theodotus' allusion to the fall[480] may have reminded the bishops that Nestorius' conversation had, likewise, been described on 22 June as being full of error. The council had acted to remove the danger of a bishop who held unorthodox ideas in office, where he had access to the ears, minds and hearts of his audience.

In a culture where malignant supernatural forces were real, Theodotus' description of heretics as personifications, agents for the devil, demons or the devil itself is not only a linguistic and rhetorical resource but also a hyperbole of the problem he was facing.[481] For the church, heresy and its adherents were a concrete problem, which it tried to tackle with preaching and sacraments. Therefore, Theodotus claimed it was essential that all bishops defended the faith at the councils, and taught properly. Else, evil could win and endanger the salvation of mankind as discussed next.

Church and salvation

This last section focuses on the few, but particularly eloquent passages in Theodotus' homilies on the soteriological character of Christology.[482] He understood the history of humanity after the incarnation as a continuous event within God's plan. Therefore, he saw the salvation of mankind both in the present existence of humanity, and as a future and final salvation.

The present day salvation was brought about by the incarnation, which led humanity to exist in a redeemed state if compared to what it was like after the fall. This is described as corrupt, low and slow.[483] In Homily III.3,[484] Theodotus refers to the active (that is, motivated by human free will) aspects of the fall in the vocabulary which variedly represents carrying and taking as the actions leading to original sin, without explicitly mentioning the taking the fruit. With expressions like 'not to bear the grace', 'to take the advantage',

[478] N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 282-4.

[479] *Cf.* Cyril *Hom. div.* 4, ACO I 1/2, 104, 22, and S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004), 125.

[480] Especially *Gen.* 3:1, 13-4.

[481] Homily VI.2: *Qērellos* 4.1, 122f. ACO I 1/2, 72, 22-4. References on evil, the devil, his influence, as a source of heresies, can be found in R. MacMullen, *Voting about God* (2006), 44, 132 (note 12); on heretics as his agents, see M. Willing, *Eusebius von Cäsarea als Häreseograph* (2008), 443, 487.

[482] G.L. Castro, *Teodoto di Ancira* (1992), 8, 34. Compare to Cyril: T.G. Weinandy and D.A. Keating (eds), *The Theology of St. Cyril* (2003), 24-31, J.A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril* (2004), 175; and Nestorius: L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 50ff.

[483] See p. 155.

[484] ACO I 1/2, 72, 16-9.

Theodotus links sin and salvation to the themes of payment, loaning and being indebted in *Philippians* 2. Thus Theodotus discusses the redemption with the terms the Pauline letters express it, and the macro-structure of Homily III exemplifies how the history of humanity and of the individuals can be represented by interrelated antithetical pairs. The incarnation leads all human beings to a relationship,[485] an aim desirable in itself since it is a connection to the divine.

Theodotus repeatedly affirms that all humanity was saved by the unique instance of the incarnation, and by each and all events in Christ's life.[486] It happened in the past and changed the state of humanity. However, only those who believe 'adequately' in the incarnate one and his life actually take part in the lifting of humanity brought about by the lowering of Christ. Especially in the conciliar homilies, the 'adequate' faith is what the council endorsed, and all the audience, particularly the bishops, ought to share it. Theodotus holds that his faith is the same of Cyril, whose teaching he praises, and of all with whom he is in communion.

Without wondering at or trying to formulate a logic behind it, Theodotus thus claims that those who are not orthodox Christians are not human beings of the same sort as those who are part of the redeemed humanity. At no point does Theodotus discuss what this other existence is. It bears strong resemblance to the state after the fall, and therefore Theodotus describes the deviation into heresy in similar terms as the fall narrative.

In Homily III, Theodotus follows an introduction on possible roles of the church as carer and purifier[487] with a representation of the 'error', the 'illness' (that is, the heresy) in question,[488] and he describes with the vocabulary of 'disposition' those who live with such deviating beliefs, and how people share religious ideas.[489] With only a fraction of the wide range of possible meanings of διάκειμαι, he expresses that heretical beliefs, as appositions of τῶν οὕτως διακειμένων,[490] are something ingrained and hard to be eliminated. However, Theodotus also envisages feasible remedies, considering the use of the same expression in the context of the metaphors of medicine and husbandry.[491] οὕτως refers primarily to badness (κακία) beyond care, but also to the oncoming allusion to the reproachable statements about Christ. Therefore the heresies

[485] ACO I 1/2, 73, 29, *cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 441, L.I. Scipioni, *Nestorio* (1974), 320ff.

[486] *E.g.* ACO I 1/2, 80, 33-4, 86, 16-7, 88, 27-8.

[487] ACO I 1/2, 71, 24-6.

[488] ACO I 1/2, 71, 27-8.

[489] ACO I 1/2, 72, 1-5.

[490] ACO I 1/2, 73, 4 is distractingly paraphrased in the translations of PG77, 1386CD and of A.J. Festugière, *Ephèse et Chalcédoine: actes* (1982), 268 who interpret the participle as referring to 'members'.

[491] ACO I 1/2, 73, 3.

are to be dealt with harshly because or at least when they come up as dispositions. That is, if a person not only incurs, expresses, argues for, but also remains in this situation deliberately, and does so in a thorough and steady way, human efforts are not able to reverse the state he is in. Claiming that a heresy is a disposition implies that all heretical actions like thinking, speaking, reasoning, and acting in erroneous ways are linked and go back to a factor which overwhelms the individual. This justifies the exclusion from the church, even if, since τῶν οὕτως διακειμένων does not necessarily carry a deterministic idea by itself, it remains implicit that however great their error, these people are no irremediable case, at least for God. Neither state of salvation or of error is unchangeable during a man's lifespan. He may lapse, but also be called or recalled to right belief.[492] God, however, does not drag men towards virtue or success (κατορθώματα).[493] Heretics willingly obey the enemy and offend the legislator. Someone who perseveres in heresy distances himself from God, who owns all creation.[494]

The salvation of each individual ultimately depends on God, through divine χάρις,[495] but every Christian has his share in that he keeps to the orthodox faith. Χάρις can assist him to that end,[496] but to the last, each individual must do his part in thriving for his salvation. The incarnation does not change the freedom of will of human beings, and thereby humanity can stray willingly from orthodox faith. Moreover, a human being can be led astray, by other people or some instance of evil present in the world. At the same time, however, for Theodotus, the freedom and ability of human beings to achieve salvation is never constrained, wherefore the responsibility of falling into heresy lies with the person. There are temptations and dangers, personified in supernatural and human evils (*e.g.*, respectively, devil and heretics), but there is equally good support (*e.g.* the holy Spirit and the orthodox bishops, respectively).

Theodotus' concept of grace[497] links the central theme of orthodox Christology to the major concern of an orthodox priesthood to guide the church.[498] From the start of the economy, grace is a means for the interaction of the human with the divine.[499] For Theodotus, the leaders of the church have, if not

[492] *Qērellos* 4.1, 130, 16.
[493] ACO I 1/2, 85, 22.
[494] ACO I 1/2, 72, 16ff.
[495] ACO I 1/2, 73, 29ff., 80, 26, *cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 171ff.
[496] *Qērellos* 4.1, 132, 5 (ܫܪܝ).
[497] Expressed with formulae with scriptural background like *Heb.* 10:29, *Rom.* 16:24, 2*Cor.* 8:9.
[498] ACO I 1/2, 71, 25. For a socio-economic approach to the 'burden of leadership' placed on the preacher, while the congregations should 'just believe' what they were told, see R. MacMullen, 'The preacher's audience' (1989), 510-1.
[499] ACO I 1/2, 72, 15.

a greater share of participation in grace, then, at least a stronger role of mediating it to all human beings. This confers on them the power to perform what pertains to their role, but increases their duties. Episcopal authority was largely related to performing sacraments, which Theodotus linked to divine grace, intertwining them with the acceptance of the divine mysteries. In the sermons, the most explicit allusions to sacraments are to the eucharist.[500]

Χάρις has a supportive role for the priesthood established by it[501] through theological insights such as Cyril's.[502] Although bishops share in human shortcomings, their utterances about God ought to agree with the faith.[503] However, heretical views at once negate the salvific consequence of the incarnation and deny the present influence of grace on the individual. The parallel structure of Homily III.1[504] implies that to 'make grace into a part of reproach' refers to objectionable approaches to 'the human in God' and vice versa. Grace refers to the joining of τὰ ἀνθρώπινα to God, and expresses that God should have interest in humans.[505] Their faith must be pure, and in agreement with that of the whole church. The bishops are figures of authority who receive the deserved respect and obedience, but they also carry a large responsibility. Importantly, they link the prospect of salvation of individuals to the purity of the church. Theodotus mentions that ultimately redemption lies in God's hands alone, but also presents a pure church as one of the few things in this world which can help individuals.

Contribution of church and council for salvation

Theodotus advocated the purity of the church to the bishops gathered for a council, defending the excision of one individual who spreads corrupting ideas.[506] However, he also alluded to the salvation of an individual who strays into error.[507] Theodotus does not discuss the tension between these ideas, which he expressed in separate passages. Excision is presented as the only solution for irremediable cases. At the same time, Theodotus seems to hold a positive view about human nature,[508] the efficacy of instruction,[509] and the involvement of grace for final salvation. He encourages conversion from heresy. Although the

[500] ACO I 1/2, 73, 30-1. Also ACO I 1/2, 86, 11, 17-8, ACO I 1/2, 88, 18-20. See also H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 575-6.
[501] ACO I 1/2, 71, 25.
[502] *Qērellos* 4.1, 122, 11.
[503] *Cf.* S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004), 121-8.
[504] ACO I 1/2, 72, 3-5.
[505] *Cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 288ff.
[506] ACO I 1/2, 71, 29-31.
[507] *Qērellos* 4.1, 130, 2, ACO I 1/2, 89, 5ff.
[508] 'his most beautiful creation': ACO I 1/2, 72, 22.
[509] 'it is reasonable from the start [...] to supply words of piety': ACO I 1/2, 72, 2.

leading argument in Homily III is the defence of a severe measure, Theodotus mentions that there can still be room for a correction, a conversion to a pure faith. It remains unclear if Theodotus included the already deposed Nestorius among those who might be saved upon conversion.[510]

Bishops could also be rewarded with a certain status of holiness in their lifetime for their steadfastness in the faith,[511] by accepting the exegesis of the church and fighting for it, even by receiving the crown of martyrdom for its sake. After the fulfilment of their lives, they would be rewarded with divine glory for it.[512] In Homily III.2,[513] Theodotus' exhortation to instruct – not only Nestorius or a heretic, but any Christian – offers the bishops the prospect of eschatological glory, and throughout Homily VI the reward is represented as a crown. Theodotus' praise of Cyril[514] assumes that a few, fighting in words and deeds for the 'right' faith, may even display a share in this glory in their life. Not only 'without fight no one is crowned', but also 'suffering is rewarded with the fortune', and tied to the 'increase in the church'.[515] This may seem a conventional wish reflecting the missionary and proselytising nature of Christianity, but in the context of June 431 and the existing split among the bishops, it probably expresses more specifically a wish that the majoritarian council might increase by being joined by more bishops abandoning the side of Nestorius and the Orientals.[516] Furthermore, the bishops expected that the conciliar decisions would be adopted and enforced by an increasing number of bishops, in dioceses throughout the Christian world, so that all would stay in communion.

For Theodotus, a human being who does not believe adequately that the incarnation happened as it did (that is, as Theodotus envisages and understands it) not only denies the fact, but nullifies its effects. In short, by heresy man has the power to undo a divine action.[517] Theodotus does not go so far as to say that the disbelief of one single human being nullifies the sanctification of humanity as a whole. The unbeliever himself is deprived of the consequences of the incarnation. Taking Theodotus' logic to its last consequences would mean that if all humanity fell into heresy, the effect of God's incarnation would be reversed, an option which Theodotus apparently never envisaged.

[510] *Cf.* M. Simonetti, 'Alcune osservazioni sul monofisismo di Cirillo' (1982), 496.

[511] *Qērellos* 4.1, 122, 7-10; 124, 11-4, *cf.* S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004), 99. See P. Gemeinhardt and K. Heyden (eds), *Heilige, Heiliges und Heiligkeit* (2012), 412-3.

[512] *Qērellos* 4.1, 132, 4ff.

[513] ACO I 1/2, 72, 6-10.

[514] *Qērellos* 4.1, 124, 11ff, *cf.* S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (2004), 230ff.

[515] *Qērellos* 4.1, 132, 4ff.

[516] A.M. Crabbe, 'The invitation list' (1981), 386.

[517] ACO I 1/2, 84, 6-7.

A heretical view of the incarnation contradicts the faith of all Christians. It is not only a problem for those deprived of the salvation brought about by the economy, since ideas can spread. Hence, with the ability and duty to lead the faithful properly, the church as a whole and the preacher in particular have a large role to play to avoid the existence of such ideas once they accept that proper guidance includes keeping error away. The church ought to be one, doctrinally homogeneous and disciplinarily undisturbed. Also the emperor expected the church to become an all-encompassing unity.[518]

An important but not explicit future component in this concern for the present state of salvation of humanity can be inferred from Theodotus' vocabulary. First, evil is still present and influential in this world. Human beings are expected to strive to limit its influence and remove it, aided by divine help, but the hope of a decisive victory over evil lingers in Theodotus' works. Secondly, when orthodox faith being rewarded is mentioned, reward in lifetime is a significant component, yet the idea of an eschatological judgement is never far.[519]

Theodotus aims for a Christian world, where heresy is absent, and thus all exist in the state in which humanity is supposed to be after the incarnation. In such a world, every human being partakes in a relation to the divine, which is a crown in itself.[520] The church had to grasp what that state was, and at councils bishops contributed to establish statements on the faith and to care for ecclesiastic purity. Theodotus preached on what the sessions were endorsing, since the bishops had to understand it so as to preach likewise in their dioceses. Then they would be contributing to the salvation of those who followed their teaching, and qualify for seeing their efforts rewarded.

The future to which Theodotus refers[521] is a time when by the action of grace, in part via the church, all human beings live in that state of salvation.[522] It would apply as a reward only to those living then and thereafter. Doubtlessly, Theodotus would have wished such an orthodox world to come into being in his lifetime, yet it remains unclear how those already dead are rewarded for their right faith. Placed side by side with homilies like Rheginus', with clearer eschatological content,[523] Theodotus' Homily VI suggests that a lifetime which comes to an end within orthodox faith in the incarnate God both experiences a sanctified state at the moment of death, and awaits for an eschatological reward in line with *Rev.* 14:13 and *Col.* 1:5a, for example.

[518] See p. 23.

[519] *Cf.* H.v. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril* (2009), 573-4, and D.A. Keating, *The Appropriation of Divine Life* (2004).

[520] *Qērellos* 4.1, 132, 2ff.

[521] *Qērellos* 4.1, 132, 3ff.

[522] ACO I 1/2, 73, 19.

[523] ACO I 1/2, 71, 8.

Thus, Theodotus' conciliar homilies are a defence of the uprightness of the conciliar proceeding and doctrine[524] by placing them in the divine order, respectively as one aspect of episcopal duty in the tradition of the church, and as an expression of the teaching received through Christ, the scriptures, the Spirit, and the fathers. He argues by expounding and clarifying a select number of scriptural passages, which were widely used in the Christological debate.[525] The exegetical passages have many parallels in Cyril's works, and if some differences can be noticed, then only in details casually mentioned and which were not yet contentious.[526] Theodotus merely spoke about some aspects of a biblical narrative,[527] including both Christ's life and the life of the church, which his audience also knew. Theodotus conceded some passages concerning God, his actions and his influence were difficult for human beings to apprehend because of their own limitations.[528] However, men ought not to remain in error, and therefore mistakes in the understanding of arguably the most influential event in the history of humanity had to be resolved. Theodotus described humanity after the fall,[529] which is the condition in which God comes into the world,[530] when he became knowable to human beings in an unimpeded manner that contrasts with the veiled revelations in the Old Testament.[531] Christ is as low as the lowest human being, and obedient to the Cross,[532] but his existence redeems humanity because he is not a ψιλός man.[533] Theodotus employed various terms and expressions to claim that the divine appropriates suffering, insisting that this is a case where divine dealings are beyond human cognition,[534] rather the most important wonder.[535] The Incarnation is redeeming provided it is properly understood, that is, as Theodotus presented it, but its efficacy is, in his view, seriously undermined by misrepresentations, like that he ascribed to Nestorius.[536] It was not only a mistake, but an evil spreading and countering the saving divine intervention.[537] There was, however, another parallel thread in the οἰκονομία where men were expected to fulfil the divine 'requests'. Theodotus exhorted his audience to accomplish the tasks which befall bishops

[524] See p. 99.
[525] *Cf.* p. 175.
[526] *Cf.* p. 175ff., 185ff.
[527] *Cf.* p. 154ff.
[528] *Cf.* p. 155ff., 162ff., 181ff.
[529] See the section on p. 155.
[530] P. 157ff.
[531] P. 162ff.
[532] P. 164ff.
[533] P. 157, 176.
[534] P. 184.
[535] P. 180ff.
[536] P. 181ff.
[537] P. 191ff.

according to Christ's commandments,[538] arguing with reference to the dangers of the spread of evil and the reward for those who believe appropriately.[539] Despite the bellicose vocabulary, it is a positive and constructive perspective on faith and the duty of bishops, promoting unity and cohesion,[540] and offering 'another' perspective on Cyril's theology.[541]

[538] P. 193ff.
[539] P. 196ff.
[540] E. Schwartz, *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431* (1927), 94.
[541] I. Rucker, 'Ephesinische Konzilsakten in armenischgeorgischer Überlieferung' (1930), 82.

Conclusion

The study set out to contribute a new perspective on the available evidence how bishops tackled the Christological debate around 430 and dealt with challenges related to the imperially summoned Council of Ephesus by focusing on conciliar homiletics and showing its significance in the wider historical and theological context. This has been achieved by clarifying in Chapter 1 the regional parameters in which Theodotus' theology and pastoral activity developed. The next chapter described the events during the Council of Ephesus in which Theodotus was involved as well as possible settings for preaching of conciliar sermons or reading of homilies. Then, the analysis of his conciliar homilies related the content to the conciliar setting, the form to the conventions of late antique rhetoric, and the texts to their reception, especially through collections of conciliar documents. The relation of Theodotus' preaching to some of the main challenges faced by the Cyrillian bishops during 431 was discussed in Chapter 3, including the defence of the validity of their sessions, their choice of Cyril's theology as representative of the teaching of the church, and their effort to become the univocal gathering of all bishops which they claimed to be. The last sections detailed how Theodotus' stated his motivations to support and safeguard the teaching of the church in relation to the arguments employed in the Christological debate – by him as well as other theologians. The result is an appreciation of the self-representation of a bishop in a conciliar setting responsible for both disciplinary and doctrinal matters, championing exclusion from communion and leadership on grounds of sound theological teaching which is concomitantly being conveyed to the audience and defended. Preaching was an important means of mobilising support among other members of the council as well as the clergy and population of the city; personal attacks, slogans, and interaction with the audience were some of the rhetorical devices employed by bishops openly defending their theological and ecclesiastical views in homiletic form.[1] These elements add a new dimension to evidence for conciliar studies, which usually analyse other sources, being more attentive to meticulous reading of minutes and documents mentioned therein or closely related to them.

Because of the specific perspective employed, the work may seem a limited contribution to conciliar and homiletic studies alike. Yet, at the intersection of the distinct perspectives, it is claimed here, a number of pertinent observations became possible that shed light on both questions and, importantly, illuminate an area hitherto neglected in scholarship of both fields. The chosen approach, for one, provides a counterbalance to the conventional exclusive attention to

[1] See L.M. Frenkel, 'Preaching at the Council of Ephesus' (2012).

leading figures. Understanding the participation of important, but not major bishops like Theodotus (who, for example, contributed to spread Cyril's perspective and helped to achieve its acceptance) gives insight into the formation of Cyril's prestige, illustrates the resonance of Cyrillian theology in the episcopate and beyond, and thus underscores that the debate was not only a personal fight over power. The few surviving sermons represent scarce, yet valuable, evidence of an additional means of communication, with which councils presented and consolidated themselves: homiletics supplied bishops a central, and likely highly effective device.

Analysing Theodotus of Ancyra's homilies in relation to the Council of Ephesus has shed light on the mechanisms of establishing and divulging theological clarification. The grounds on which the defence of orthodoxy relied cannot be explained in isolation from the theological content both in Theodotus' statements at conciliar sessions and also in his homilies. The connection is especially clear in the brief conciliar homilies, and accordingly they were the appropriate sources to be analysed here. The Council of Ephesus has a role in all that is related to Theodotus. The scarce information available about the author is associated to the council and its aftermath, the collections of Ephesian documents are central for the transmission and reception of most of his texts, including those prior to the council, while all his later writings incorporate the arguments of patristic authority with which he defended the Cyrillian Council.

Against the background of church and society in his time (Chapter 1), a study of the participation specifically in the Council of Ephesus has portrayed Theodotus as a bishop who was, in the conciliar events as well as in the Christological debate, above the average. His rank of metropolitan bishop and the status of his diocese are reflected in the order of the acclamations and votes. His deeds displayed a greater engagement, whether by frequent interventions at the sessions of 22 June, 10, 11 July, which included the important statement against Nestorius, or by his participation in the delegation to the emperor. Theodotus' erudition, evidenced in his writings, can also be seen in the style of his involvement at the council. By the analysis of Theodotus' participation, it has been possible to gather some information about conciliar processes without relying on the better known leading characters: Cyril, Nestorius, as well as Acacius of Melitene, Juvenal of Jerusalem, John of Antioch, Theodoret of Cyrrhus. These figures are often too controversial in two regards, at least. It seems that the information about the major bishops' involvement in Ephesus 431 is coloured by what happened later, to an extent which cannot be determined precisely. They have close connections, often borne from personal involvement, with events leading to and during the Council of Chalcedon, and its reception. The delineation of theological parties, as well as the emerging or developing dogmatic controversies caused prejudices on the reception of the Council of Ephesus even in the early subsequent years. The problem does not apply to the same extent to Theodotus whose role in the doctrinal, ecclesiastic

and political disputes after Ephesus 431 was very limited. However, his role in Ephesus in 431 was significant enough to offer a complex image of the mechanisms of underscoring theology in authoritative teaching received from tradition and clarified at councils. The second problematic aspect of seeing the most important characters as representative of the issues at the First Council of Ephesus is the extent to which their individual conflicts and agendas showed through their actions at Ephesus, and that events at Ephesus were about them. Theodotus can be seen as a better paradigm for all the other bishops gathered in Ephesus and their engagement. Even if he stands out to some extent, and may have had his own church-political agenda and theological preconceptions, and is therefore not a template for all bishops, his participation does not come from the same level of personal involvement as that of the major bishops. Focusing on Theodotus allows us to see the council from an angle which is not that of the authors of a major part of the works associated with it. In other words, Theodotus has been assigned (and fits) into a party of the theological debate, but never has it been attempted to define or identify one of the parties with him.

Theodotus' actions were mostly discussed in the first sections of Chapter 2, which provided the background for the subsequent analysis of his rhetoric. The focus on conciliar homiletics made it necessary to point to the relation of the sermons not only to the general literary conventions, but also to specific aspects derived from the conciliar setting in the next sections. As far as the analysis of Theodotus' works in the synodical setting allows generalisations, it is likely that conciliar sermons had little impact on the outcome of the sessions, where theological and church political issues dominate. Rather, they consolidated the unity of the party and offered resources to argue for the views it was endorsing. Expanding this material, the third chapter first analysed how the content of the homilies reflects the Council of Ephesus, both in its agenda and in the events. The reception of the works was also analysed, in the initial setting of a congregation, and later as part of collections of documents or homilies. The relation of the works to the conciliar contexts refers to the theological issues at stake, and points to the motivation for preaching also to the council. The homilies were composed for the sake of defending the faith, and how the council's authority was related to a tradition expressed in theological terms. The last chapter also set out to explain why universal orthodoxy mattered, exploring Theodotus' theology and the connection he posited between salvation and orthodoxy. To do so, it was necessary to sketch what Theodotus considered orthodox, at least regarding Christology, which prevails in all his works and is the theme better represented in the extant sources. Theodotus' Christology has many similarities and some differences to Cyril's views. The sermons give a valuable insight into the possibility of accommodating some variants, while not tolerating others, such as views considered Nestorian. While delineating Theodotus' Christology, aspects of his ecclesiology and soteriology became evident. This outlined the theological background in which Theodotus sees the role of

preachers and bishops. They have to convey to all Christians the faith, which is taught by the church. They are responsible for their own salvation and that of their audience and their congregation. However, at least as a rhetorical tool, Theodotus emphasises the need that all human beings become and remain orthodox for salvation to be fulfilled, not nullified. Thus, when problems about a tenet of faith, like a proper Christological understanding, are found among a congregation, the preacher is bound to try to convey the orthodox view, anchored in the authoritative tradition. The last chapter thus showed how Theodotus preached at the council in support of the authority of the Cyrillian sessions, so that the theology they endorsed would be acknowledged as part of the teaching of the church.

From the historical study of the first two chapters, it may be suggested that in the first quarter of the fifth century the Christological problems were geographically more widespread and multifaceted, and less related to personal formulations of a Nestorius or a Cyril. Theodotus developed Christological themes building on the topics and arguments of fourth-century Arian and Trinitarian debates. The controversies had involved several bishops of Ancyra, and the region had a reputation of tolerance and accommodation. He preached against views which may have developed endogenously in Ancyra independent of Nestorius' or Theodoret's influence. After all, Ancyra had close links to Antioch then, and it would eventually fall under the control of Constantinople. In any case, Theodotus may have formulated his reaction against a 'Nestorian' Christology independently of Cyrillian influence in Galatia. Not only is Cyril's propaganda little documented and hard to date, but Theodotus' homilies point to a more 'monophysite' view.

It is likely that Theodotus noticed, at the latest while in Ephesus, that similar educational or theological backgrounds could lead to opposite approaches to theological problems, while dissimilar backgrounds could lead to solutions which, albeit not identical, held in common what seemed to matter. On the one hand, Theodotus and Nestorius may have had in common an Antiochene educational background and an Oriental monastic experience, but faced with theological, devotional and liturgical developments in their dioceses, they tended to opposite Christological views. On the other hand, Theodotus found someone who defended similar theological points of view in Cyril, who came from an 'Alexandrian' background. Cyril referred often to Athanasius' authority, but his theology was influenced perhaps even in equal measure by the Cappadocians. Their works served both Cyrillians and Orientals to underscore their own claims. A few circumstances suggest Theodotus had early links to Antioch, but his theology has little relation to a so-called Antiochene approach, typified by comparison to the works of Nestorius, John and Theodoret. Rather, Theodotus' homilies transmitted in the Cyrillian collections of conciliar documents show similarities of vocabulary and arguments to the sermons of Cyril and Acacius, for example. His writings correspond to the theological affiliation

he acknowledged in Ephesus.[2] A good education in a specific tradition, immersion in a sound theological heritage or a fine religious life experience were not enough to lead someone to keep the right faith, however well intellectually trained and gifted. Nestorius' downfall epitomised the dangers arising from what human intellectual faculties can achieve regarding the divine mysteries. Theodotus' reticence to reasoning is a Christological argument and probably also a pastoral concern, confirmed by the events during the Council of Ephesus.

The caution against reasoning contributed, it seems, to a reliance on authority, on theological slogans, and reticence towards investigation of theological matters. Theodotus suggested that the solution for the church was to rely on unchanging authoritative statements. These would be the scriptures, short slogan-like passages from some fathers and especially the Nicene creed. Theodotus preached about the reliance on authority to the conciliar bishops, defending that conciliar decisions should be grounded on these pillars. He relied on their authority when preaching in Ancyra, both before and after the council, and when writing his treatises.

Theodotus employed such yardsticks with a hierarchical gradation which was made possible by his attitude to language. Scripture is the central source of authority, from which all other assertions derive their strength. In homilies he could expand scripture with passages which resembled it closely, or with rhetorical figures interwoven in scriptural allusions. Theodotus argued for the authority of the fathers next, especially in Homily VI. Their teaching provides strength to the church. It is endorsed by tradition, through use and repetition of allusions, encapsulated in selected excerpts, but does not extend to every text of a father of acknowledged authority. This contrasts with scripture,[3] from which any excerpt, however much torn out of context, is theoretically authoritative to serve as a proof-text, although during controversies enemies were often denounced for inappropriate exegesis.

The validation of the teaching by the living tradition of the church has its high point in the approval of texts at synods and councils. Credal formulae are, in this regard, a special example. Early examples echo scripture much, but most extant texts are patristic formulations that incorporate non-biblical vocabulary. The formulae do not draw authority from the endorsement of individual bishops, however intellectually or hierarchically elevated, but from collective and unanimous approval, where the accordance of many is meant to reflect divine

[2] A question not addressed here are the mechanisms for countering 'novelties' relying only on the already available authoritative content, which may not answer precisely the problems, before a synod offers 'clarifying' options. Homilies I and II, seen as pre-Ephesian homilies, would exemplify this.

[3] Although manuscript evidence points to the availability of various readings in the fifth century, the canonicity of a version is not a debated issue in the extant texts related to the Council of Ephesus.

guidance. The Council of Ephesus relied on the Nicene creed, setting it apart of other credal formulae and statements of faith.[4]

The allusions to patristic formulations and explanations mainly refer to succinct excerpts synodically approved or endorsed by the 'living tradition' of the church. The brief phrases tend to acquire a slogan-like character. Correspondingly, slogans, like '*Theotokos*', are taken up, and by recurrent use stand for the orthodox answer to heresy. Theodotus' homilies indicate that he sometimes built also on the veneration of saints, apocryphal narratives, and popular devotions as appealing examples of orthodox tradition. He used their efficaciousness to refute 'mistaken' theological claims.

Theodotus' homilies conveyed to bishops and congregations the importance of the conciliar decisions and made orthodoxy relevant for their religious life.[5] He claimed that a proper understanding and acceptance of theology was a *sine qua non* condition for the salvific validity and effect of the incarnation. To this end he expressed clearly that the 'right' view was anchored in tradition, emphasising the authority of the church and of the fathers of the church.

In festal sermons, Theodotus spread 'orthodoxy' by instructing his flock with allusions to the central topics of the contemporaneous theological debates alongside the themes which form the main argument of the feast, or together with images linked to popular devotion, and he did not address openly and directly the theological difficulties. In order to tackle heterodoxy, first it was encapsulated in set phrases, which could then be attacked without exposing orthodoxy to questions at the same time. Slogans, like those attributed to Nestorius, were to a large extent theological absurdities, standing in contradiction to authoritative catchwords and formulae, such as 'for our sake', and '*Theotokos*'.

In Ephesus, Theodotus was an ally with Cyril whose ideas he claimed to be worthy to commend as authoritative. Theodotus acknowledged Cyril's importance, and put it in the context of the council's role of defining orthodoxy and church policy, which ought to influence imperial policy and the οἰκουμένη constructively. The agenda and rhetoric of the documentation of Ephesus predominate in the arguments which could indicate reciprocal influence between Theodotus and Cyril. Theodotus espoused the Cyrillian viewpoint forthrightly, but his rationale may have had some influence. For example, some arguments in Homilies I and II are only echoed in works which Cyril wrote after the session of 22 June.

Theodotus' thoughts cannot be considered ground-breaking. At best, he stands as a forerunner of trends in conciliar authority and reliance on slogans that are better seen at Chalcedon. Theodotus' actions and especially his statements about ecclesiology and salvation exemplify his argument about the need of an

[4] Theodotus later addressed its centrality in the *Exp. symb.*

[5] See C.B. Horn, *Asceticism and Christological Controversy* (2006), 3 on continuing concern of whole segments of the population with the theological debates.

unwavering commitment to a certain set of ideas and beliefs. The constancy to a faith formulated within schematic boundaries can be seen at work when Theodotus and Nestorius could not surpass the gulf which had emerged between their theologies, foreshadowing the post-Chalcedonian schism. Theodotus' output is an early testimony of coherently adopting an approach to religion and faith that highlights the love for the mystery, and claims to disparage religious polemics.[6]

[6] See p. 5.

Appendix

Translation of Theodotus' conciliar homilies

The translations of Theodotus' four conciliar homilies have been prepared from published critical editions,[1] taking into account some existing translations.[2] Even if every translation is an interpretation, an attempt has been made not to impose through the version an explanation. I tried to add only as many words as necessary to meet English grammatical requirements, and to preserve the possibility of various meanings of the participles, particles and pronouns.

A.2. Homilies preached at the Council of Ephesus

The structure of the texts of Homilies III and VI is indicated with brief comments in square brackets.

Homily III

p.71 l.20 Homily by Theodotus of Ancyra, pronounced in Ephesus against Nestorius, in the church of St. John the Evangelist

> [The session of 22 June is described with the images of the medical topos. Nestorius is the corrupted member which is severed to avoid the spread of the infectious error. The church is explicitly described as the holy priesthood.]

I What the doctor is for our bodies, the priest is for the souls.
Indeed, since the error is an illness of the souls, and, if it carries on, it brings the punishing death,
l.25 the grace of the Spirit has established[3], as remedy, the holy priesthood,
and it has severed the member that was affected by the suffering,
not being unsparing with that one, but sparing the remaining members.

> [The church is diseased when its holiness is blemished. An error is dangerous when it spreads, which is possible when there is contiguity and communication. To cease these is seen as a treatment, described with emphasis on the oldness of

[1] E. Schwartz, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum* (1914ff.) and B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), respectively. Superscript page and line numbers refer to the critical editions, while superscript bold roman numbers refer to the paragraph numbering in PG 77: J.P. Migne, *S. Cyrillus Alexandrinus, Theodotus Ancyranus* (1859), 1349-89.

[2] Homily I-III: *ibid.*, A.J. Festugière, *Ephèse et Chalcédoine: actes* (1982), 267-94; G.L. Castro, *Teodoto di Ancira* (1992), 69-104. Homily VI: B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 123-33. My thanks to Peter Fisher for his help with the translation.

[3] ὠικονόμησεν.

this traditional remedy, alongside claims that it is both necessary and beneficent. The need to plant and sever is described in antithetical clauses, alongside the use of terms of husbandry. Finally, the ideas which the next paragraph counters are introduced.]

Since indeed the contiguity[4] of the rotten faith causes a communication[5] of the evil, it severs the member so as to sever the evil, and that is not cruelty, but medicinal treatment.
It is weeping that the doctor severs the member, but the sparing makes severing a remedy.
l.30 It is an old form of treatment, and it goes back to the origins: that is how also the saints[6] have taken care of this most-sacred church.
For the priest also carries a sword, not to harm, but to cure.
This, grace has previously first conveyed to Jeremiah when it says: 'Today I appoint you over nations and kingdoms to uproot and tear down, to destroy and overthrow, to build and to plant.'[7] For piety is not planted p.72 if corruption is not first severed.
Doubtlessly it is reasonable from the start to water, to employ care for farming, to supply words of piety, to apply all care to the member:
but if badness becomes stronger than care, excision is the medicine for those thus disposed.[8]
Indeed, how would one remedy one of those so disposed, who criticise in God the human aspects, l.5 and make grace into a part of reproach?

[In a fictional dialogue, the interlocutor voices elements of Nestorian Christology, and Theodotus answers that they deny the salvation brought about by the incarnation.]

II What do you say? Answer me! I deny, says he, that God has suffered.
If you are looking at the nature, you see well;
but if you take away completely the suffering, you deny the dispensation[9].

[In antithetical statements the incarnation is described in a narrative of descent, that is brought about by the love of God for mankind, and that lifts humanity up.]

No longer insult the suffering God, but consider the usefulness of the sufferings!
God has descended into indignity,
not diminished with respect to nature, but conferring his grace.
He remained what he was. And he has assumed what he was not.

[4] τὸ συνεχές.
[5] μετάδοσιν.
[6] οἱ ἅγιοι.
[7] *Jer.* 1:10, translation from the NIV.
[8] τῶν οὕτως διακειμένων.
[9] οἰκονομία.

He remained God according to his [1.10] nature, he became what you are on account of his philanthropy for you.

[The incarnation is described as a salvific outrage. Christ is the doctor on whom the care depends. He accepted all the human, including the sufferings, in order to save humans, because of the fall.]

Do not turn into outrage[10] the manner of the care. Do not offend the doctor!, even if by the meanness of the body he procured the cure. For this meanness is not an outrage, but a sign of the philanthropy.
He descended towards you, not to remain down, but so as to lift you towards him. Do not reject the descent, so as not to lose the ascension.
Accept the outrage which has generated glory for you. The nature has not been outraged, but the grace conveys to you the good things.
Because of you, the outraged servant, the lord [1.15] has been outraged!
He took up what is yours, since you had abandoned what is his.

[The fall and its consequences.]

III We distanced ourselves from the good lord.
We did not bear the grace that was being given by the lord.
We, loaning, took the advantage of paradise.
We transgressed the law. We offended the legislator.
We obeyed the enemy. We fell out of honour.

[The incapacity of human beings to escape the fallen state on their own.]

The runaway lived in this earthly place. [1.20] He has not lifted the head towards the lord.
Pleasure held down the fugitive. Sin held captive the runaway.
It was hopeless for our mind[11] to lift the head towards God. What then?
Would my slowness cause God the loss of his most beautiful creation, the human being?
But the God of the universe did not suffer this.
Neither was it necessary that envy would rule over the grace of the lord, nor that the gift of God should be defeated by the plot of the devil. Then what did the lord do?

[The manner of the incarnation, God appearing in extreme lowness so as not to frighten.]

[1.25] He became near the runaway one, for the slave was not able to go near him. He became near the servant, not in lordly majesty, nor sending ahead a guard of honour of angels, nor putting into motion phalanxes of archangels, nor moving flames, nor shaking the elements.

[10] ὕβρις.
[11] διάνοια.

That would be to make the runaway a fugitive.
But he came near wishing to catch the fugitive, wanting to possess his own creation.
He does not frighten by what appears[12], but he calls for association[13] l.30 by the meanness of the person.[14]
He became a co-slave, in order to be proclaimed lord.

[Exegesis of *Phil.* 2:5, criticising those who divide Christ in attempts to say precisely what suffers.]

IV For because of this the great apostle said: Each 'among you consider[15] this which was also in Christ Jesus'.[16]
There he says Jesus.
Tell, which? The mother gave the appellation to the new-born: 'You shall call his name Jesus'.[17]
Where is he who divides the Christ? Where is he who does equivocality[18] to our mystery, and on the one hand says Christ (is) one, but on the other supposes two?
l.35 One the slave, the other the lord; one the sufferer, the other the not suffering?
What is the benefit p.73 of one single appellation, while positing two things?
Each 'among you consider this which was also in Christ Jesus!'[19] He says Jesus of this seen one, the virgin called thus.
Each 'among you consider this which was also in Christ Jesus!'[20] For what did we consider in Christ Jesus?

[Exegesis of *Phil.* 2:6-7a, contrasting the emptying of God with the absence of detriment to his divine attributes, so that Christ had no need to reach out to any divine aspect.]

'Who, being in form[21] God, did not consider equality l.5 with God a booty to be grasped'.[22] What is it, that is being said?
He, who took freedom out of a booty, does not sustain anything servile, in order not to cause detriment to freedom.
Then what is he?

[12] φάινομαι.
[13] ὁμιλία.
[14] πρόσωπον.
[15] φρονείτω.
[16] *Phil.* 2:5.
[17] *Luke* 1:31.
[18] ὁμωνυμίαν ἐργάζομαι.
[19] *Phil.* 2:5.
[20] *Phil.* 2:5.
[21] μορφή, occasionally rendered as 'nature'.
[22] *Phil.* 2:6.

Since by nature he was lord, he 'did not consider equality with God a booty to be grasped',[23] for what [pertains to] the dispensation did no harm to the divinity. 'Who, being in form God, did not consider equality with God a booty to be grasped, but emptied himself'.[24]

V Tell me the [l.10] emptying of the only-begotten!

[The sufferings are the expression of Christ's appearing as human being, without any detriment to the divine impassibility. The miracles, performed by him as God, showed him as such.]

If he had not suffered the human [aspects], how was he emptied?
Whenever I say that God has suffered, I say [it] keeping the impassive nature.
For suffering was appended[25] to God: not a passive nature, but the union to the suffering.
For when the philanthrope lord had decided to sympathise with the servant (but he was holding the impassive nature), he united to himself the suffering that fulfilled the project[26].
Thus the lord became near, thus he approached the fugitive,
as a [l.15] co-slave appearing, and as lord acting well,
the form of a slave[27] showing, and the grace of a lord conferring,
hungering[28] as a slave, and gushing forth breads as God,[29]
toiling as a human being, and on the surface of the sea walking as God,[30]
shrinking from the cross as a human being.[31]
Indeed, what appeared was made believable[32] by the sufferings, and the hidden one was shown by the wonders.
Thus he appears as a human being, leading us all together to the relationship.[33]

[Praise of the piety practised in Ephesus as a reflex of John's teaching; final doxology.]

John, [l.20] he imposed for us as teacher, the son of the thunder, he who conferred to this metropolis the common treasure of the world[34], he who in one single verse

[23] *Phil.* 2:6.
[24] *Phil.* 2:6-7a.
[25] περιάπτω.
[26] σκοπός.
[27] *Cf. Phil.* 2:7b.
[28] *Cf. Luke* 4:2, but also by sound similarity of πεινάω and ταπεινόω to the 'lowering' in *Phil.* 2:8a.
[29] *Matt.* 14:13-21; 15:32-9 and similar; *John* 6:1-15.
[30] *Matt.* 14:22-32, *John* 6:16-21.
[31] *Matt.* 26:37-44.
[32] ἐπιστοῦτο.
[33] οἰκειότητα.
[34] οἰκουμένη.

has expressed all the piety: for 'the word', he says, 'became flesh'.[35] The being[36] became flesh, on the one hand being because of the nature, on the other, becoming because of the dispensation!
Through whom and with whom to the Father the glory, and the power, with the Holy Spirit for ever. Amen.

Homily VI

p.122 [Homily] By Theodotus, bishop of Ancyra in Galatia, on that day.

[While greeting the bishops in the audience, Theodotus recognises approvingly their joy for the victorious achievements against Christological heresy, and places Cyril at the centre.]

1. Cheerful and happy I see this assembly,[37] and strengthened by the fight for the faith, which you have fought, because you have fought well,
and in your faces[38] is visible l.5 the joy for the fight, as the soul looks through the eyes, and reveals itself, in the face, how it is.
Rejoice, you good sons, in the assembly of the good and of the holy fathers!
Rejoice, you pure sons of the faith, be happy that you see Christ glorified! Your crown is this choir of the fathers, and in its midst is l.10 the precious stone that is come from Egypt by the greatness of the grace of the lord.

[Egypt is praised as a means to commend its patriarch Cyril and serves as thematic link to scriptural passages relevant for Christological topics: the exegesis of the flight into Egypt places emphasis on the childhood of the incarnated and reiterates that Jesus was a fugitive for our sake.]

2. Not for such a gift was the former Egypt designed.
Today it has become heaven, because the light of the sun in the sky does not shine like this, as Egypt shines.
First, because in there was p.124 the child Jesus, having become a fugitive for our sake;
then, when they who would not recognise the incarnation[39] despised his flight, the child, who for our sake fled, Egypt received.
And at that time it was honoured through the child, which is the creator of the whole world, and who became a child for our sake.

[35] *John* 1:14.
[36] ὁ ὤν.
[37] ጉባኤ: congregation, synod.
[38] ገጽ: possibly for πρόσωπον. See A. Dillmann, *Chrestomathia Aethiopica* (1866), 273.
[39] ትስብእት: incarnation, taking on of human nature, but also humanity, human nature. See A. Dillmann, *Chrestomathia Aethiopica* (1866), 197, H. Ludolf, *Jobi Ludolfi I.C. Lexicon aethiopico-latinum* (1661), 134-5.

[Suffering proved in what Christ appears, his actions vanquished the devil. Praise of Cyril on account of his Christological teaching.]

Do not pay heed[40] that he fled, [l.5] oh renegade,[41] but pay heed that the flight of the child drove into fleeing the devil!
Because he did not flee out of fear, but to demonstrate his humanhood.
For he became a human being for your sake, to demonstrate, in your[42] suffering, in what he was visible.
Therefore, do not underrate the sufferings, because through them he demonstrated his humanhood.
Then, Egypt was honoured, when as [l.10] a child, in body[43] Jesus was there; for a child he became, as your very self, to make you a child by meekness.[44]
Today, however, there is one in it[45] who with the saviour shines forth like him in the midst of the crown, and enlightens the souls by righteousness, in that he teaches the faith.
In truth,[46] therefore, rejoice now, and exult, pure fathers, in that you pay heed!

[As in the opening, opposition to the spread of unbelief is described as a successful battle.]

3. [l.15] And I wish to show you another joy. And which is this?
Numerous were the billows of unbelief, but they could not shake us.
Much battle happened in the opposition[47] to your faith, but no one [p.126] wavered.
Arrows were released, but no one is wounded.
The enemy banded together, but, defeated, fled, amazed by the strength of the church and its faith.

[The success of the fight against heresy is due to the strength of the church, which comes from its foundation on the biblical rock (*Matt.* 16:20). The rock is first described as the wisdom of Christ, and in the ensuing fictional dialogue, a paraphrase of *Matt.* 16:13-20,[48] Theodotus presents elements of his Christology.]

I admire and marvel at the wisdom of the building-master Christ, who built it, and a rock it is, on which the church was built.

[40] **ነጸረ**: consider, reason about.
[41] **ዕልው**: perfidious one, heretic, but also in *Matt.* 17:17.
[42] Therefore, human.
[43] **ሥጋ**: incarnate, bodily.
[44] **የወህኅ**: simplicity, rectitude.
[45] *I.e.* Egypt.
[46] **አማንኬ**: alternatively: your belief.
[47] **ኮሕደ**: controversy, disobedience, infidelity.
[48] The cited verses are never identical to but follow most closely R. Zuurmond, *Novum testamentum Aethiopice* (2001), 356 or 357.

4. [1.5] Do you want to become acquainted with the rock, on which you[49] are built and are unshakeable?
The saviour, in conversation with his disciples, said: Whom do humans call me, the son of man?
I do not speak about my concealed [thing],[50] but about what is visible.[51]
Whom do humans call me, the son of man? –
Do you not know, [1.10] o lord, the heart of human beings?
You, who live in our mind,[52] do you not know our heart?
What is unknown to you, who [even] knows what will be, before it comes to be? –
whom do humans call me, the son of man, me, the visible one? Say, whom do humans call me? –
Some call you Elijah; others call you Isaiah, and again others [p.128] call you one of the prophets, themselves honoured.[53] –

> [The faith of the bishops is probed and those whose Christology questions the incarnation of God in the 'visible one' are confuted.]

But you, oh rocks of the church? –
Where was he, who would have said about Christ, that he is an honoured man, and would not have believed about him that he is the incarnate one?
If he had been an honoured man, then the honour of a prophet would have been enough.
[1.5] If it was not enough, then he was the incarnate one. –
Whom do humans call me, the son of man? – Some call you Elijah; others call you Isaiah, again others call you Jeremiah, and others call you one of the prophets. – But you, whom do you call me, the visible one, not the concealed one? –

> [The conclusion of the dialogue based on *Matt.* 16:13-20 emphasises the divinity in Christ, as the correct understanding of the incarnation.]

And replying [1.10] Peter narrated[54] that which became foundation and rock of the church.
And what did he answer?
'You are Christ, the son of the living God.' The visible one he called 'son of the living God'.
And he did not rebuke him, as if he had honoured him above his *ousia*,[55] but praised Peter blessed. 'Truly', he answered and [1.15] said to him: 'You are blessed,

[49] You: plural.
[50] ክበታ.
[51] ዘያስተርኢ.
[52] ሕሲና: *cogitatio*; also: spirit, intent.
[53] ክብሪ: renowned, glorious, distinct.
[54] ነገረ: explained, enunciated.
[55] ህላዌ: essence, existence, substance, nature. Used *e.g.* for ὁμοούσιος.

Simon, son of Jonah, for not what is body[56] has revealed [this] unto you, but my father, who is in heaven.' –
Oh renegade, become blessed and not condemned! –
Blessed are you, Simon, son of Jonah, for not what is body and the blood have revealed [this] unto you, and because you called me, the visible one, 'God word',[57] and the mystery of the incarnation,[58] truly, you p.130 recognised, and what is in the form of a servant, lord you called.

> [The correct understanding of the incarnation, and Peter, on account of having it, are the foundation of the church. Its strength comes from its members supporting themselves on it. Confession of an undivided Christology.]

Receive therefore the earnings from the lord! Henceforward I give you a power, that goes beyond[59] honour, and I say to you: 'You are Peter, and upon this rock I build the church'.
5. l.5 Thus, this rock is our foundation, and therefore the billows of the error[60] will not shake our building, and it shall be for us all, that we may support ourselves on it.
On this rock of the faith shall we be built, and be in Christ Jesus, in that we believe in one and only son of God, in that we do not divide and do not separate the one.

> [Those who attempt to introduce divisions in Christ are equalled to the snake (= devil).]

l.10 For what was united shall not be separated, and what grace has united, the mind[61] shall not separate.
Why do you, oh virile one,[62] dissolve the incarnation? God united himself to man.
And why do you envy the progeny[63] of man, and equal yourself to the snake of the earth?.
For also it envied the work of God, when from dust a likeness of himself l.15 he formed. And today you are envious, when he has made his likeness the consort of his throne.
Do not be amazed about it!
But if you truly wish to be envious, then envy him who was once created according to the image of God.

[56] ሥጋ.
[57] ቃል: λόγος.
[58] ትሥጉት: embodiment; not ተስብኦ, used elsewhere.
[59] እምንተ: alternatively: 'is more than', or 'comes from'.
[60] ጌጋይ: alternatively: impiety.
[61] ሕሲና.
[62] ብእሲ: man, husband; but similar to ብእስ: worse, contend.
[63] ትወልደ.

[Exhortation of commitment to the defence of the faith, assurance of success, despite troubles, in view of the solid faith foundation. Vows of growth of the church in the concluding doxology.]

p.132 6. By these words let us therefore be erected on this great rock, and praise him, who is God above all, in that you strengthen your minds in you!
Fight, my friends, for the sake of justice, for without fight no one is crowned.
And because of this, with fortune is rewarded the l.5 suffering.
And to us all may be given, by the grace of Christ, the lord, that we, in the holy church of Christ Jesus, increase, erected on the foundation of the apostles and prophets.

A.3. Homilies said to have been read at the Council of Ephesus

In the following translation of Theodotus' Homilies I and II, I ventured to suggest the late antique reception of the text even more than in the rendition of the conciliar sermons. Accordingly, the English vocabulary envisages an audience which employed Greek not only for religious purposes and was somewhat familiar with the socio-political structures of the Roman Empire.[64] For the sake of a clear rendition of Theodotus' theological lexicon, the expressions on nature, division, thinking, appropriation and movement are translated as systematically as possible. The effort to preserve words, such as λόγος and πρᾶγμα, may have led to a dense text which, it is hoped, echoes the original also in occasional opaqueness.[65]

Homily II

p.73 l.25 (Homily) By Theodotus, bishop of Ancyra, at the engendering of the saviour, read aloud in the synod, in the time of the Bishop Cyril

I The theme of this present feast is splendid, and conveys a common salvation to human beings.[66]
And splendid also is the present gathering, which welcomes grace gratefully. l.30
And abundant grace is given to those who welcome her with gratitude;
for so great a measure of bounty is provided as the greatness of the gratitude of those to whom the grace is conveyed,
as when you[67], taking bounty, gratify the giver, not only having repaid for the things you took, p.74 but also making the giver more of a debtor to you.

[64] For example, βασιλεύς and derivatives are translated as 'emperor', also in citations of and passages that allude to *Matthew* 2.

[65] Parentheses enclose added words; square and angle brackets refer to text critical marks in E. Schwartz, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum* (1914ff.), and as in it, Homily II precedes I.

[66] ἄνθρωπος.

[67] You: singular.

Gratefully then, accept[68] the grace, by exhibiting that this audience is splendid for us!
Yet the theme of the feast is God's manifestation towards human beings,
the coming of the ever-present one,
the visit of the all-fulfilling one,
the attention of the all-seeing one.
'He came into his own', he says, 'and his [1.5] own did not receive him',[69] rather 'he was in the world and the world came to be through him, and the world did not know him'.[70]
But ignorance itself is not part of the accusation against[71] human beings.
For God is unattainable to human reasonings because of the divinity of (his) nature;
for it is not natural for the mind of human beings to descry him.
The divine nature eludes the mind of human beings; it is loftier than our reasoning.
We then suffer loss [1.10] of knowledge of God through (his) better nature; in order that precisely that does not come about, the invisible takes up a visible nature,
the one who is not governed by touch accepts a body that is tangible.
The invisible God becomes seen;
the word is tangible;
the only-begotten child of God becomes akin to the slaves,
in order that the nature which surpasses the human being may not pass unnoticed by the recognition of human beings.
And do not consider strange to God the son who came into being.
II For long ago the advent[72] of God was pre-prepared; [1.15] he, appearing, was always made known by human characteristics, appropriating from us materials which can be seen.

For let a Jew come forward into the midst;
let anyone who utterly disbelieves the manifestation of God that appeared to human beings in the nature of a human being come forward!
Let him tell me, how did Moses see God?
Did he see the invisible nature?
In no wise! For it is unattainable to human reasonings.
But how [1.20] did he see? Talk!
(He saw) fire being kindled out of the bramble and not destroying the bramble.[73]

[68] You: plural.
[69] *John* 1:11.
[70] *John* 1:10.
[71] κατηγορίας: alternatively 'predication of'.
[72] παρουσία.
[73] *Cf. Ex.* 3:2.

Then why do you disbelieve in the one who was born from a virgin and who did not destroy virginity?
Or, on the one hand, hearing that God speaks out of the bramble and says to Moses, 'I am the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob',[74] and that Moses, falling down, makes obeisance,
do you believe, not reasoning about the seen fire, but the speaking God;
on the other hand, whenever I recollect a virgin womb, l.25
you loath it and turn away.
For what is more worthless, talk!, a bramble or a virgin womb spotless as regards the sufferings of sin?
Do you not know that ancient things are a practice for the newer and for the things that have come to be now? For the mysteries are prefigured through what is old[75].
Because of this, a bramble is kindled, fire appears and the elements of the fire[76] neither operate nor indeed afflict.
Do you not see, in the bramble, the virgin?
Do you not behold, in the fire, the philanthropy of him who descended?
The judge (is) among l.30 the condemned and judgement does not come about; the arbiter, among the sentenced, and nowhere retribution.
The judge has been established, yet not judging but teaching, not sentencing but healing.
Do you see how that gentle fire thus disclosed philanthropy?
Do not wonder if he, being God, is born through a virgin's p.75 womb; for God does not consider anything an outrage which is a cause of salvation for human beings.
Yet do not give me this retort, that the nature of God is mean, as it once became attainable for outrages.
For nothing of the mean things that he decided on for our sake outrages that nature, but he appropriates[77] lesser things[78] in order to save our nature.
Then, since the mean things do not outrage the nature of the blessed God, but produce salvation for human beings, l.5 **III** how will you say that the motives of our salvation became causes of outrage to God?
Therefore, today God became visible through a virgin, and the virgin remained a virgin and became a mother. For the agent of incorruption does not produce deterioration; the maker of immortality corrupts nothing.

Yet, since Photinus also says that the one who is born is a mere human being, denying that the l.10 birth[79] is from God, and assumes that the human being coming forth from the womb is divided from God,

[74] *Ex.* 3:6.
[75] τῶν παλαιῶν.
[76] τὰ πυρός.
[77] οἰκειοῦται.
[78] τὰ ἐλάττονα.
[79] τόκον.

let him now say to me how the human nature, being born through a virgin womb, preserved the virginity of the mother uncorrupted. For no mother of a human being has remained a virgin.
Do you see how what happened provides me with a twofold concept of who was born?
On the one hand, if he was born like us,[80] he was a human being;
on the other, if he preserved the mother as a virgin, he who was born is made known as God by those who consider properly.
For God visited the world, not interchanging one place for another, [1.15] but having enveloped himself with my nature, and, as I said, wished to be visible, (he,) the invisible one by nature,
so that from the birth he did not begin to be God, but (began) to appear to human beings.[81]
For since he was God, he undertook to become a human being because of the philanthropy towards us,
in order that we should embrace the judge as (our) kin,
in order that we, who have no free-speech (arising) from our own accomplishments, are able to be confident.
For having been led to the tribune, they, [1.20] who do not speak freely through their own[82] virtues, reap free-speech as if from their own[83] kin.
What then?
God visited as a human being, not exchanging one place for another, but exhibiting the invisible nature as visible
and having been seen as human being, and appeared akin to human beings, even as the evangelist announces, saying that 'the word became flesh'.[84]

IV [1.25] And how, says he, did the word become flesh? How was it possible for the divine word to become a human being?
Do you ask the way of God's wonders?
If the incomprehensibility of the word was attainable for us, it would not be a wonder, but a natural thing[85]; but if what has come to be is a wonder and a sign, concede the word to the wonder-working lord!
For that he came about, I wish you to know and to reap the profit for your faith from what happened; and how [1.30] he came about, concede to him who effects it!

[80] καθ ἡμᾶς.
[81] ὥστε οὐκ ἔσχεν ἀρχὴν τοῦ εἶναι θεὸς ἐκ τοῦ τόκου, ἀλλὰ τοῦ φανῆναι ἀνθρώποις: 'so that he did not possess a beginning of being God, but of appearing to human beings'. Compare with ACO I 1/2, 77, 24; 30-2, and, in Homily I, ACO I 1/2, 82, 18-9.
[82] οἰκείων.
[83] ἰδίου.
[84] *John* 1:14.
[85] κατὰ φύσιν πρᾶγμα.

Or do you believe the doctor, who prescribes, and do not meddle with the way of the treatment, trusting your own salvation to the art[86], though [p.76] any one else, who is unskilled, meddles with the way of the art; but on the one hand gain knowledge of what came to be, on the other, concede the way to the art!
Yet, do you seek after the words of all the wonders that have been worked by God as though you were in need of (the) words, in order that you also might work the same wonders for God?
But precisely what I was saying, I say now: of a thing, of which we know the word, [l.5] its nature is neither wonder nor sign.
Such is what I say.
A builder creates a house:
we know the word, we gain knowledge of the materials put together, we are able to talk about what has come to be, although because of (our) unskillfulness we will not be competent to effect it.
The only-begotten moulded from mud eyes for the one blind since the hour of birth;[87]
this is beyond our word; a wonder it is called, not investigated by reasonings of human beings; a sign it is called that happened beyond habitual[88] [l.10] nature.
And that it came to be we know, but we are unable to talk of the way.
For tile and brick are prepared out of mud, (but) a nobility of eyes is not moulded, fine membranes do not come to be, changefulness of seeing is not assembled, exactness of a sphere is not rounded off with such a fine mien.
Mud is not by nature proper to be lifted up towards a nobility of eyes. Surely then, it is precisely that that the nature of the earth does not admit; for it is not by nature proper to admit of the idea of an eye, [l.15] it accepted this from the wonders-working one, who drew the nature towards his own will, while he himself is not a slave to the word of nature.
No longer then rely on a weakness of human nature nor say:
how did the nature of a human being have room for God?
how did God become a human being?
how did the word of God become a visible flesh?
But believe that it came to be, (and) allow the one who has made it to know the way.
[V] And if you also will to articulate clearly out of an illustration what is set before (us), [l.20] I will show you how the incorporeal is embodied, the invisible is seen, the intangible is tangible,
not having been altered according to his own nature,[89] but having taken up a visible and tangible shape.

[86] τέχνη.
[87] *Cf. John* 9:1.6.
[88] συνήθη.
[89] τῆι οἰκείαι φύσει.

This word, the one spoken, which I call of the human beings, by employing which we associate with others, and explain notions[90] to one another,
is a word not seen, nor touched with hand, only resonating through hearing.
But whenever I adduce the spoken [l.25] word as an illustration of the enhypostatic word of God,
you shall not consider that I say that the divine word is spoken! Begone!
For word is said of the only-begotten, while divine scripture explains the impassivity of his engendering, since the mind of human beings also gives birth to the word impassively.
Because of this, there it designates the son of God himself,
here it names a word,
elsewhere the divine scripture calls (him) effulgence,[91]
saying each of these names about him, in order that [l.30] you may think the things said about Christ exempt from blasphemies.
For sometimes it employed such designations, sometimes others, willing that the instruction appropriate to the glory of God is made.
[VI] Such is what I say: it calls the only-begotten 'son of the father', having willed to present the homoousion by the glory.[92]
For since your son comes to be for you of the same nature (as you), the word, wishing to show one single essence of father and son, says son of the father of the only-begotten engendered [l.35] out of him.
Next, since engendering, and son, provides us with an impression of the suffering according to [p.77] the engendering,
it designates this son also word, revealing by this name the impassivity of the engendering.
But since someone who, admittedly as a human being, becomes a father is exhibited older than his own son, while the designation itself provides that (we) observe the father before the son,
so that you shall not retort the same also of the divine nature, but [l.5] shall think that the only-begotten already existed with the father continuously, it calls 'effulgence' the only-begotten of the father.[93]
For the effulgence is born out of the sun, while in no wise it is thought as taking place later than the sun, but we think that exactly from when the sun (is), then also (is) the effulgence born out of the sun.
Then let the effulgence disclose for you that the son always existed with the father!
Let the word reveal the impassivity of the engendering!
Let the son make known the homoousion! [l.10]

[90] τὰ ἐνθύμια.
[91] *Cf. Hebr.* 1:3.
[92] Alternatively, 'having willed to represent the homoousion to the glory'.
[93] *Cf. Hebr.* 1:3.

VII But let us recapitulate what is set before (us),
and let us reveal the manifestation of the divine word born today,
and let us exhibit through an illustration how what is not seen by nature becomes seen,
and what is not tangible because of (its) incorporeal nature, is found, tangible.
Therefore, this word, which we speak, <which is in> the communications [which] we employ is an incorporeal word, not appearing to sight, not being tangible by touch.
But l.15 whenever the word puts on letters and sounds[94], it becomes apparent, is grasped by sight, is tangible by touch.
For me, then, assume one speaking with another!
The pre-existing word is not seen, is it? We do not touch with (our) hands the word that is poured out, do we?
However, if you write on papyrus those (words) which you said, what you did not see beforehand, you see later, and the very kind[95] of word which you did not touch beforehand, you shall touch through the papyrus and the letters.
Why?
Because the incorporeal l.20 word puts on the body of the papyrus and the shape of the sounds.
Surely then, since the illustration became clear and you remembered by habitual[96] illustrations,
come, let us show how the only-begotten son of God(,) the divine word, who is eternal with the father(,) being incorporeal as to the nature(,) appropriating a nature of a human being(,)
later was born through a virgin, not beginning to be God, but beginning to appear (as) a human being.[97] l.25
For you shall not say: since the only-begotten has been engendered from[98] the father, how was he born again from a virgin?
Out of the father he has been engendered by nature, out of a virgin he has been engendered through dispensation:
that, as God, this, as a human being.
Since your word also is an offspring of your thought, but, whenever you will to put in sounds and letters and you wish to imprint on the papyrus the word – this to which your mind gave birth – you write the letters with your hand, and in some way l.30 with the hand you give birth to the word again, which did

[94] στοιχεῖα: also 'elements'.
[95] εἶδος.
[96] γινομένωι κατὰ συνήθειαν.
[97] οὐκ ἀρχὴν λαβὼν τοῦ εἶναι θεός, ἀλλ ἀρχὴν λαβὼν τοῦ φανῆναι ἄνθρωπος: 'not taking a beginning of being God, but taking a beginning of appearing a human being'. Compare with ACO I 1/2, 75, 17-8; 77, 30-2; 37; 78, 1.
[98] παρά, while in this paragraph all other 'from' and 'out of' correspond to 'ἐκ'.

not then began to be[99] when the hand was imprinting the letters, and did not then come forth into being[100] when the hand was imprinting the letters,
but on the one hand it is engendered from the mind,
on the other, the word accepted the beginning of appearance[101] from the hand which imprinted the letters.
VIII Since then the illustration has become clear, and the image[102] (is) best-known, come, let us accommodate the image to the archetype.
Here mind,
there think of a father;
here l.35 you know a word being born out of the mind,
there, think of a word essential and enhypostatic, engendered out of the father;
here behold a hand giving birth to a word through letters,
there think of a virgin in labour with the word through the body, not indeed giving the beginning to divinity through p.78 birth – perish the thought! – but to God appearing to human beings, having become a human being.[103]
For since he became exactly what I (am), he was, perforce, born exactly as I, with my nature and, perforce, he decides on my birth.
Because of this the divine word also appropriated begetting, and welcomed the virgin as mother and came through a womb adorned with virginity. l.5
For God loathes nothing of what he moulded, since indeed nothing of (his) works became unworthy of him.
Everything is beautiful and very beautiful, if we see these things as the moulder saw what had come about: 'For God saw all things as many as he had made, and, look, very beautiful'.[104]
Behold everything with impassive eyes!, and you, like God, behold them very beautiful.
Banish the suffering, and gain knowledge of the nobility of what came to be!

IX l.10 What then is wonderful if God settled within his own work and house?
You, however, say on the one hand that he dwells in heaven worthily,
on the other you think that the human being is his sole unworthiness,
judging things[105] not by the truth of the words, but by the suffering and the preconception.
What then is loftier, tell me: heaven or human being?
For God, what is more prised: sun or human being? l.15

[99] οὐ τότε λαβόντα τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ εἶναι: 'which did not then take the beginning of being'.
[100] οὐδὲ τότε προελθόντα εἰς τὸ εἶναι.
[101] τοῦ δὲ φανῆναι τὴν ἀρχὴν ... ἐδέξατο.
[102] εἰκών.
[103] τὴν ἀρχὴν θεότητι δοῦσαν ... τὸ φανῆναι θεὸν ἀνθρώποις γενόμενον ἄνθρωπον. See above, ACO I 1/2, 75, 17-8; 77, 30-2.
[104] *Gen.* 1:31.
[105] τὰ πράγματα.

For me, do not heed the splendour of the sounds[106], nor prefer nature for the fine mien, nor be astounded with the radiance that leapt from the sun, nor that I am clad in skin and flesh,[107] according to the divine Job, but examine the nobility of a reasoning soul.
Behold the preparation of a human-being and wonder at the living being.
He is mindful of being able to govern and lead all living beings: he took hands, serving the wisdom of the mind, organs creative of manifold art;
only one of all the created beings came to be free of necessity; [1.20] God created only the human being as lord of his own judgement.
Do you not see that the sun is constrained to run (its) course? Do you not behold its uniform motion? Why?
Because it did not become lord of its own judgement.
And you proceed freely, you perform what you want, you do not have necessity forcing you through life, you were instituted free by the soul.
A sun, a slave of necessity, but a human being, free as to (his) judgement.
Then, who is better, tell me, the slave or the free man? [1.25]
The one under the yoke of necessity or the one detached from all necessity?
Nothing is wonderful or unbelievable if God abided in (the) human being which he welcomed, straightaway moulded in his own image.
x For God straightaway at the beginnings of creation exhibited the purpose about the human being,[108] on the one hand, having taken soil from the earth and having moulded it, on the other, having prepared the image of his own divinity.[109]
Why then out of a mean nature did he mould thus one whom he intended to honour in the preparation?
Why [1.30] did he make the [actual] human being without having taken (him) from the utmost splendour of the sun, but from earth, and plasters him of soil, when the element[110] lies below and is trodden-down?
Do you will to understand for whom?
Because he intended to honour the human being by the image, he gives him the mean nature, in order that the excess of honour does not excite the human being towards madness,
in order that whenever he was honoured beyond the nature, he was abased through the recollection of the nature, and he gains knowledge of the greatness of the honour, [1.35] not of his own worth, but of the grace of the giver.
Surely then, this was also philanthropy [p.79] of the preparer, that the image of God has (its) nature from earth;

[106] στοιχεῖα: also 'elements'.
[107] *Cf. Job* 10:11.
[108] *Cf. Gen.* 2:7.
[109] *Cf. Gen.* 1:27.
[110] στοιχείου: also 'sound'.

for he had the nature (as a) pledge of measured purpose: XI so that the human being (should be) a noble living being even if later outraged by the sufferings entering unawares.
Do not then see him as having given offence, but reason about the nobility of the image of God before the transgression of the law.
Why then do you l.5 disparage the expelled (human being), forgetting his first preparation,
and not reasoning about the ancient honour, which God rendered him again with much distinction, having united to himself his own image?
Nothing then came to be without[111] his philanthropy. Neither is it outraging to a good lord to share in (the) slavery of the slaves towards a gain of the servant.
For the good one is not outraged by these things, but what he really is is made known through such things. l.10
And do not wonder at the matter!
Indeed, if you should now prepare yourself as a house of God, he would also dwell in you, even if not so as in Christ: for in Christ 'the whole fullness of the divinity dwells bodily'.[112]
But lo, what a wonder!
The whole fullness of the divinity dwells bodily in a single one,
and fills all, and outdoes the creation,
being entire in a single one, and distinguished from none of the creatures.
And indeed do not let l.15 what has been said appear impossible to you.
Indeed, I also now speak a word: this word is in a single one and the word came to be in all,
and a single one had room for the entire word and the word is not circumscribed by a multitude.
Therefore, if also a thing[113], which comes to be and decays, abides entire in a single one and comes to be in all,
what appears wonderful to you if God both abided entire in a human being and is found in all?

XII l.20 Therefore the theme of todays assembly (is) that God becomes a human being, deciding on the human things in order to give the divine things,
and appropriating the sufferings, in order to gratify impassiveness,
entering unawares upon death in order to present immortality.
And he acquired the sufferings of the human beings for his own, not altering the nature,
but appropriating this[114] by (his) judgement,

[111] ἀπαῖδον: 'childless of'.
[112] *Col.* 2:9.
[113] πρᾶγμα.
[114] Unclear antecedent, possibly 'suffering'.

and he makes these things very suitably, proposing to save the human being.
Then, for what sort of motive has he made the sufferings [l.25] of the human beings his own?
Because he wanted to destroy the suffering by suffering and to make death ineffective by death,
and he willed to overthrow similarities[115] through similarities,
he appropriates the cross,
he makes the buffeting his own,
he has made the chain his,
in order that the sufferings, having become God's, take authority over sufferings.
For neither was God's nature wronged – indeed, not by any change of his own[116] did he accept the sufferings –
and the sufferings take from God the strength against similarities.
Henceforth, then, [l.30] death, having become as of God, makes death ineffective, and having died, it undoes the tyranny of death, since he was both God and a human being.
For the Jews did not crucify a mere man, neither did they nail the visible nature only,
but they brought (their) daring to the God (who was) in it,[117] who had appropriated the sufferings of the united nature.
And in order that this also should become clear to you, let us bring the word to the illustration which was said in the beginning.
XIII Let it then be posited that [p.80] the emperors pronounce a word,
and that this is imprinted in letters on some papyrus to dispatch the so-called *sacra*[118] to the cities, a word clothed with both papyrus and letters, gratifying freedom or conveying another imperial bounty to the needy.
But let this so-called *sacra*, in the language of the Italians,[119] be received by someone,
(who is) an unbeliever and disobedient and hostile to the city and an enemy of the emperor, and he, having taken the papyrus, tears it apart. [l.5]
What was torn here? Tell me!
Only the papyrus, or the imperial word also?
Truly if papyrus was torn apart with regard only to itself, the destroyed (object) was cheap; he who tore was not accountable, or accountable for five obols only.
But he receives the ultimate penalty – and is punished – and by it is brought to death,

[115] τὰ ὁμοειδῆ.
[116] μεταβολῆι ἰδίαι.
[117] εἰς τὸν ἐν αὐτῆι θεὸν ἤγαγον τὰ τολμήματα.
[118] Alternatively, 'the *sacra*, which was said'.
[119] Alternatively, 'this *sacra*, which was said in the language of the Italians,'.

not for only having maltreated papyrus, but as if he had also torn apart the imperial word.
Truly [1.10] the word of the emperor is impassive, neither by its nature having been taken with hands, nor being able to be torn apart,
however, it was also itself torn apart, having appropriated the suffering of the papyrus and the letters.
Do you see how the impassivity accepts suffering, whenever it shares[120] a suffering nature?
For the word was not torn apart in its own nature, and it accepted the suffering of the papyrus and of the sounds.
XIV Wherefore let the Jew not be confident that he crucified a mere human being. [1.15]
For what appeared was a papyrus, yet the word hidden in it (was) imperial from nature, not spoken by tongue.
For the only-begotten is said word, yet not a spoken one, but an essential and enhypostatic one,
which on one hand suffers nothing through its own nature,[121] being an impassive word,
and on the other, makes its own the sufferings of what appears,
and, just as the imperial word itself both accepted the matter of the letters, and the suffering of the papyrus became the word's own, [1.20]
so the only-begotten word of God has made the sufferings of the crucified one his own.
Because of this, just as one who maltreats an imperial *sacra* is lead to death as if having torn the word of an emperor,
so the Jew who crucified the appeared one receives the penalty, having extended the daring to the divine word itself.
Henceforth God avenges what happened as his own suffering.

But what has been said is enough, since it is also necessary to ponder your recollections!
For the multitude [1.25] of things that have been said, gushing over the concept of the listeners, makes the listener forgetful of what has been said.
But by God's grace may it come to pass both that through recollection you embrace what has been said,
and, secondly, that you benefit from these things, and inherit the empire of the heavens in return for them!
May it come about that we all succeed to that,
by the grace of Christ, to whom be the glory and the power for ever and ever. Amen.

[120] κοινωνήσηι.
[121] τῆι οἰκείαι φύσει.

Homily I

p.80 l.30 By the same, said on the day of the nativity of our saviour Jesus Christ, and itself read aloud in the same synod.

I The theme of this present feast is both splendid and strange.
Splendid, because it brings a common salvation to human beings.
Strange, because it has conquered the word of nature[122].
For nature no longer knows the virgin who gave birth, but grace not only showed her giving birth, but preserved her virginity, p.81 made her a mother, and did not destroy the virginity.
For it was grace which preserved chastity.
O seedless earth, which blossomed with the fruit of salvation!
O virgin, who overcame the very paradise of Eden!
For while it brought forth the stock of propagated plants,[123] after bringing forth trees out of virginal earth, the virgin herself is better than that earth.
She did not l.5 bring forth trees of fruit, but the Jesse Tree,[124] providing the fruit salvific for the human beings.
That earth was a virgin and she herself (was) a virgin too;
but there God ordained it to produce trees, while from this virgin the creator himself became an offspring in the flesh[125].
Neither did that accept a shoot before the trees, nor did she herself impair the virginity by the birth.
The virgin has become more glorious than paradise, l.10
for paradise was merely the planting of God, but she cultivated God himself in the flesh,[126]
who decided on being combined to the nature of a human being.

[122] τὸν τῆς φύσεως λόγον.
[123] *Cf. Gen.* 2:9.
[124] *Cf. Isa.* 11:10.
[125] κατὰ σάρκα.
[126] Until this point, the beginning of Proclus' Homily IV has many expressions and sentences in common with this homily, as highlighted in the following citation:

> *The theme of this present feast is both splendid and strange.* Splendid, for it brings an extraordinary salvation to humanity. *Strange, for the birth of a child has conquered the* laws *of nature.*
> *And while nature* cannot conceive of the mother who gave birth, *grace not only showed her giving birth, but preserved her virginity, made her a mother, and did not destroy* her incorruptibility.
> *O seedless earth, which blossomed with the fruit of salvation! O Virgin, who* opened *paradise* for Adam!
> Rather she is *more glorious than paradise, for paradise was merely the planting of God, but she cultivated God* himself in the flesh.
> Let us then all draw near, not to dance at the wedding of the master's mother, for she is a virgin with no experience of wedlock [...]

Did you[127] see how the strange mystery that surpasses the word of nature came to be?
Did you see the thing[128] beyond nature which came about through God's power alone?
Did you see the word beyond the word[129] being born?
Because the one who is born is the word of God, it is clear from these things that he did not undo the virginity. 1.15
She who gives birth to mere flesh is deprived of virginity; but when the word of God is born from flesh[130], it preserves virginity, showing himself as word.
And when you hear the word, think of the essential and enhypostatic, not that which is poured out through the mouth.
II Then is born the only-begotten son of God, who is also called word, not taking out of the birth the beginning of being word, but making the birth (the) beginning of becoming a human being.[131] 1.20
Before time the word was God, co-eternal to the begetter;
then, when he willed to become a human being because of human beings, not by a change of divine nature but by a wonder and a will of God, he welcomed the birth as (the) beginning of becoming a human being.
Because of this, the word is born as human being, and, as God, preserved virginity.
For neither does our word, being born, destroy thought, nor does the essential and enhypostatic word of God, deciding on birth, 1.25 corrupt virginity.
Therefore, what came to be is beyond a word of nature, and no longer does it conform to a word of nature: I tell you a wonder. Do not disturb the reasonings!
I tell you that God was born, deciding on birth, not making a beginning of (his) divinity.
Being God, he appropriated birth, the birth did not prepare him as God.
What he was, he continued (to be), and he became what he was not.
Therefore, wishing to become exactly what he was not, because of dispensation, he decides on birth as the 1.30 beginning of the dispensation.
He became a human being, yet the nature was not altered, the limits of divine essence were not disturbed;
for 'you are the same and your eternity does not cease',[132] says holy scripture, and 'you reside (in) eternity',[133] making this evident, (namely) the unchangingness of the divine essence.

[127] You: singular.
[128] πρᾶγμα.
[129] τὸν λόγον ὑπὲρ τὸν λόγον.
[130] Alternatively, for σαρκί 'in flesh'.
[131] οὐκ ἀρχὴν τοῦ εἶναι λόγος ἐκ τοῦ τόκου λαβών, ἀλλὰ τοῦ γενέσθαι ἄνθρωπος ἀρχὴν τὸν τόκον ποιούμενος. Compare with Homily II, ACO I 1/2, 75, 17-8; 77, 24, 30-2; 37; 78, 1.
[132] *Ps.* 101:28.
[133] *Bar.* 3:3.

And again it says: 'the same I am, and have not changed'.[134]
Therefore he became a human being while the essence of God was not disturbed nor altered into another nature.
For otherwise what came to be would not have been a wonder, if he had accepted a different nature through a change in nature. 1.35
For many such changes of things[135] come to be with us, but God performs a wonder inasmuch as, remaining what he was, he became what he was not,
and indicating just that the great apostle said: p.82 'who exists in the form of God',[136]
he says 'exists', but never 'existed', so as to show the lastingness of the nature.
'Who exists in the form of God, deemed to be equal to God not a prize',
he says 'to be equal to God', never 'to become'.
Then again he proclaims, saying: 'But he emptied himself, taking the form of a slave'.[137]
Do you[138] see how he remained what he was, and 1.5 emptied himself into the form of the slave,
both being that, and becoming this,
having performed a wonder – not having altered nature –,
having willed it – not having been compelled by change of essence?
For what God says, he does, even when what is being said is beyond the word of nature.
For to perform wonders he also has the power which is both capable and does not await the words of the nature.
Because of this, he both exists as God and empties himself into a slave's form,
he both is equal to God and becomes a human being, 1.10
he both is eternal and submits to birth,
and performs precisely those wonders which the word of nature does not know.

III Thence both the Greeks reason Christ's mystery is a folly and the Jews say the word of the dispensation is a stumbling-block,
and Paul made it evident, saying: 'We proclaim Christ crucified, on the one hand a stumbling-block for the Jews, on the other, a folly for the Greeks'.[139] 1.15
Why a folly for the Greeks?
'Because the souled[140] human being does not accept the things of the spirit, and they are a folly for him'.[141]

[134] *Mal.* 3:6.
[135] πράγματα.
[136] *Phil.* 2:6.
[137] *Phil.* 2:7.
[138] You: singular.
[139] 1*Cor.* 1:23.
[140] ψυχικός is often translated as 'natural', 'unspiritual'. Exploring the semantics of 'souled' helps to preserve the linguistic links behind Theodotus' attribution of λογισμοῖς ψυχῆς to the ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος.
[141] 1*Cor.* 2:14.

For the souled human being, seated next to[142] the nature, and examining all things by reasonings of (the) soul, reasons a folly the wonders of God, which do not have with them the word of nature.
Indeed, when the Greek hears that the saviour entered while the door was locked,[143] having brought through this dense body (of his), which needed a place, he laughs, not believing [1.20] the wonder, but seeking the word of the thing[144].
And when he hears that a child-bearing virgin remained a virgin, he deems the word a folly, not having learnt to believe in God's wonder-workings.
Surely then, when he also hears that God became a human being unchangingly, he thinks that what came to be is impossible, demanding too (that) herein (there should be) a change of nature.
But Paul did not teach thus, when he said that the one who is equal to God became a human being.[145] For he says that he emptied himself, not that he cast away the [1.25] fullness of the divinity.
On this account he also said: 'We proclaim Christ crucified, on the one hand a stumbling-block for the Jews, on the other, a folly for the Greeks.'
And why is it a folly for the Greeks if a mere human being has been crucified? Nothing which came to be according to nature is considered foolish. If what suffered existed naturally, how is the narrative considered foolish?
But, he says, when we proclaim Christ crucified, we again say <he (is)> power of God and wisdom of God [1.30]
– for 'to those who are called,' he says, 'both Jews and Greeks,' we proclaim 'Christ, power of God and wisdom of God'[146] –,
proclaiming that God's wisdom is crucified, he says,
we are considered to talk foolishness by the Greeks, who know not to believe in a wonder-working God, but disturb reasonings about the nature of everything, and who deem (they) outrage God, who appropriated sufferings, in order to save the sufferer.
For they do not see the achieved aim, which is salvation [1.35] and is proper to the goodness of God,
but they only say that God joined sufferings to himself, not examining the accomplishment of human beings' salvation from this.
Nothing that saves a human being outrages God, who by them is shown not subject to suffering, but loving mankind. [p.83]
[IV] Nonetheless, he says, I do not dare to attribute a human beings' sufferings to God.
Surely then you neither say that he saves the human being from the sufferings, nor that by the cross he exposes the power of the devil,
nor that he nailed our sin to the wood,

[142] *Cf. Luke* 10:39.
[143] *Cf. John* 20:19.
[144] πρᾶγμα.
[145] *Cf. Phil.* 2:6.
[146] *1Cor.* 1:24.

nor that through his own sufferings he cures the sufferings of human beings,
nor do you say that he made death ineffective through death. [1.5]
If God had not appropriated the sufferings, whence (came) such great accomplishments through the sufferings of Christ? how did powers come to be?
How is death destroyed by death, if God did not make it his own?
But these sufferings, having been appropriated by God, took the strength for such great accomplishments from divinity, becoming as God's own, but they did not impair the essence of divinity in its own impassiveness, which always remains.
How was the record of sin (that was) against us, nailed to the wood,[147] [1.10] when a mere human being bore the cross?
How did the cross crucify sin, or death break up the tyranny of death,
unless these had become God's and had taken the power from him, while he appropriated what was ours[148], not suffering in nature[149]?
And indicating just that, the great apostle said: 'No one of the rulers of this age knew' the mystery of the lordly suffering; 'for if they had known (it),' he says, '(they) would not [1.15] have crucified the lord of glory'.[150]
[V] On this account, we say both that he remained what he was, and that he became exactly what he was not.
For remaining in essence what he was, he accepted sufferings, having united himself to the suffering nature.
He became a subject,[151] without having laid aside empire;
he became a human being, while remaining both God and word;
being incorporeal as to the nature, he became flesh unchangingly.
How and in what way?
Not as you are able to reason, but as he is capable of working wonders. [1.20]
For whenever I tell you a wonder, abandon the reasonings!
For wondrous and prodigious things are strengthened by belief in God and are not investigated by reason.
Nor is any other of the wonders according to our reason, but each came about similarly, even if our reasoning does not attain the thing[152].

The Magi also admitted these things, having believed the star and not being inquisitive[153] about [1.25] nature.
The gentiles accept wonders through belief, and what do you, believer, disbelieve, falling by human reasoning?

[147] *Cf. Col.* 2:14.
[148] τὰ ἡμέτερα.
[149] Alternatively, for φύσει 'by nature'.
[150] 1*Cor.* 2:8.
[151] *Cf. Phil.* 2:8 (however, ACO I 1/2, 83, 17 refers to *Phil.* 2:9).
[152] πρᾶγμα.
[153] πολυπραγμονήσαντες.

Those who descended from Chaldea, as the evangelist[154] said today, showed, through their gifts,
the mystery to someone who comprehends the aim of the gentiles well.
For they brought as gifts a threefold kind[155] of presents – gold, incense, myrrh:
on the one hand, gold because he who is honoured was emperor,
on the other, incense, because he who had been born was God;
for through custom they had brought this [1.30] to whom they consider gods[156].
They also offer myrrh, disclosing by it, I think, the suffering of death.
Do you see how the Magi too recognised that he remained God and also became a human being, accepting death?
For he became the very thing which I am, in order to raise our nature towards his own worth.
For the union (of two) does this: (it) combines[157] to each one the things of the other.
Because of this, then, being God, he became a human being,
in order that a human being [1.35] might also become God, lifted up towards divine glory by this combination,
so as to be a single one and itself, both divinely glorified and suffering what is human.

And all who admit the union of divinity [p. 84] and humanity would agree with us on them!
For what has been united is no longer named two but one, [if] by concept you divide again and examine each according to itself[158].
Surely then you undo the union:[159]
for it is impossible both to preserve the union and to examine each at the same time according to itself, but what was united came to be one indissolubly and no longer becomes two.
[VI] But, I distinguish by rationalisation only, he says.
Surely then you also undo the union [1.5] with the same rationalisation; for by what you might separate one from the other, by this you also sever the combination.
Then why do you split the saving dispensation, thinking of two and cancelling the union?
But even as the great apostle also says: 'Jesus Christ is the same, yesterday, today and for eternity',[160]
saying (that they are) one and the same, God eternal and a human being, who began from (a certain moment in) time,

[154] *Cf. Matt.* 2.
[155] εἶδος.
[156] τοῖς ὑπ αὐτῶν νομιζομένοις θεοῖς.
[157] συνάπτουσα.
[158] κατ ἰδίαν.
[159] Alternative reading: '... but one, if you again divide [...] to itself, then surely you ...'
[160] *Heb.* 13:8.

and we admit that [1.10] the same one (is) God and a human being, being the one before, and becoming the other later.
But, says he, how did the only-begotten become a slave, remaining what he was, and becoming what he was not?
Do you then wish to understand this?
Understand[161] that he came to be, yet only he who works wonders knows how he came to be;
for neither are you able to tell me how the Egyptian river became blood, while the nature of the water remained unchanged.[162]
Indeed on the one hand, the Hebrews enjoyed (it) as water, on the other hand, [1.15] the Nile became blood for the Egyptians, and became what it was not, while remaining what it was.
Tell me the way (of this)! But you cannot tell: for it is a wonder of God, which rejects reasonings.
And how in Egypt did light become darkness,[163] without having become extinguished, but remaining what it was?
For it was day for the Israelites and splendid light surrounded them, but this light became darkness for the Egyptians,
and what was seen, being one, was at once light and darkness, without having been quickly turned from this, [1.20] and becoming that.
For while the light did not suffer anything, darkness came about, when God worked miracles and did not await the word of nature.
Then how did the water of the Nile, while remaining water, become blood?
Or how did the light, while remaining in its own[164] nature, become darkness?
For this was not destroyed and became that.
For the nature of the water was not destroyed, and the Hebrews revealed this by being able to drink[165] it;
but the nature both remained itself within [1.25] its own limits and became blood, which precisely it was not, when God shows the wonder beyond word.
VII And how did the Babylonian flame become dew for the three youths?[166]
Indeed, it was flame and became dew, and both these things are revealed by the operation.
For, on the one hand, the three youths, being cooled by this, taught that it was dew; on the other, the Babylonians who were burnt by this disclosed that it was also flame.
Do you know how the fire remained fire and became dew?

[161] Alternative reading: 'Then, if you wish to understand this, understand...'
[162] *Cf. Exod.* 7:20.
[163] *Cf. Exod.* 10:22.
[164] ἐπὶ τῆς ἰδίας.
[165] πότιμον ἔχοντες.
[166] *Cf. Dan.* 3:48.50.

what was seen was not two things[167] [l.30] nor two natures,
but one and <the same>.
For that which was flame became dew, and the just (persons) bear witness to it.
Therefore no longer ask me the way of the signs of God. [p.85]
For again I will tell you on the one hand what came about, showing the wonders,
on the other, leaving it to God to know the word of the wonders[168].
Tell me next:
God works these wonders and <preserving> the flame makes dew, without altering the flame and transforming it to dew,
wishing to undo the sentence of the tyrant, and willing to avenge the wronged ones, and [l.5] wishing to consume the guilty gentiles
[– and God works such wonders, preserving the fire within its own limits and exhibiting dew,
and, in order that the three youths should be saved, God worked such wonders –],
yet, in order that God might save the world, do you doubt that God, remaining the same, became a human being?
It was not necessary to alter the flame in order to produce dew,
and wishing himself to become a human being because of the salvation of human beings, was it necessary to alter his own nature? [l.10]
(The) fire remained and became dew, and you say: how does God remain and become a human being?

For then, wishing to save our nature, God prepared our salvation not through others, but through himself, since all creation was enervated in respect of our salvation, seeing that we have the habituation[169] to both evil and error;
for the great habit[170] of evil, which rejected the nature, became contrary to nature for the human beings:
a prophet prophesied, but the word was enervated, [l.15] defeated by evil;
angels became ministers of our salvation – and the great Paul bears witness to (it), saying of angels: 'Are they not all ministering spirits, who were sent out into service for those who are about to inherit salvation?';[171]
an angel, stronger as to the nature, ministered toward our salvation, but no human being was saved, being seriously involved in evils,
therefore everything was enervated towards the indifference of human beings; [l.20]
for the evil of the malicious defeated the zeal of the good,
not because God is defeated, but because he entrusts virtue to a judgement from the freedom of choice,[172]

[167] πρᾶγμα.
[168] τῶν θαυμάτων τὸν λόγον.
[169] ἕξιν.
[170] συνήθεια.
[171] *Heb.* 1:14.
[172] ἀλλ ὅτι γνώμηι τοῦ αὐτεξουσίου τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐπιτρέπει.

he does not force you by necessity towards accomplishment, nor does he drag (anyone) who does not wish (it) towards virtue,
so that having prepared for you virtue (as) voluntary, he makes accomplishment itself yours.
VIII What then?
Since prophets had been defeated,
and teachers were not efficacious,
and law was enervated,[173]
and angels failed in the zeal,
inasmuch as the judgement of human beings l.25 does not yield to the good (things),[174]
the maker of nature himself visited, wishing to restore nature, which had been defeated;
and he descends –
not resounding as God[175]
nor terrifying the ears with thunders,
nor throwing round himself darkness and showing dreaded fire in the darkness,
nor frightening the hearers with (the) voice of a trumpet, as once he presented himself to the Jews, producing fear,
nor frightening the servant, –
rather, he invites him with grace and goodness. l.30
He does not introduce a guard of archangels;[176] he does not rouse up the armies of the angels.
For he did not will to frighten the one who became a runaway fugitive from that law,
but the lord of all comes in the form of a slave, throwing round himself poverty, in order not to frighten the prey.
He was born in an unseen locality, having chosen for engendering an unnoticed field;
he was born through a poor virgin, and he took on himself all poor things, in order to catch the human being quietly for salvation. p.86
For if he had been born gloriously and descended throwing round himself much richness, the unbelievers would say that the extravagance of richness performed the change in the (inhabited) world[177].
If he had decided on the great city of Rome, they would reason about the change in the (inhabited) world by the lordship of the citizens.
If he had become the son of an emperor, they would have ascribed the gain to the lordship. l.5

[173] *Cf. Rom.* 8.
[174] Alternatively, 'does not give way to good (persons)'.
[175] *Cf. Exod.* 19:16.
[176] *Cf. Matt.* 26:53.
[177] οἰκουμένης.

If he had become the son of a legislator, they would have ascribed the gain to his commands.
But what does he do?
Every [action] poor and mean, everything average and unnoticed by the crowd, so that divinity alone should be made known (as) modifying the (inhabited) world.
Because of this, he decides on a poor mother, a poorer native-land, he comes to be lacking money.

And let the manger explain to you the lack.
For since no couch exists on which the lord may lay down, [1.10]
he is placed in a manger,[178]
and the helplessness of advantage becomes a most beautiful disclosure of prophecies.
For he was laid down in the manger, disclosing that he will be nourishment for ineloquent (persons) too.
For the word of God, living in destitution, and having been placed in the manger, drew to himself both rich and destitute, both (the) eloquent and (the) slow in the word.
Do you see how the lack of advantage performed the prophecy,
and the poverty illustrated that he, who was poor because of us, (was) accessible to everything? [1.15]
For no one was discouraged, fearing Christ's excessive richness;
(the) grandeur of an empire hindered no one from approaching him, but he who exposed himself for the salvation of everything was seen as common and destitute.
In a manger, then, the word of God is laid down, also through (the) mediation of the body,
so that both reasoning and ineloquent know how to partake of (the) abundance of the saving nourishment.
And perhaps the prophet also loudly proclaimed this beforehand, describing the mystery of this manger, saying: [1.20] 'An ox knows the owner and an ass the manger of his lord, but Israel does not know me and the people do not perceive me'.[179]
For even if the word has a simpler concept, showing the Hebrews as (the) most unknowing among the ineloquent, it may, however, also be possible to reveal this, that it illustrates the manger of the lord upon which was placed the one who became nourishment for those (who were even) more unreasoning.
Indeed, the prophet does not reveal the manger indeterminately, but this manger he affirmed [1.25] (as being) 'of his lord', indicating, I think, the manger definitely by this connective.

[178] *Cf. Luke* 2:7.
[179] *Isa.* 1:3.

And on the one hand, let (anyone) who wishes philosophise over these things, revelling in the changeful consideration of divine scripture!

IX On the other hand, we have shown that the rich (being) was poor because of us, making salvation easily grasped by all through the word of divinity.

And indicating just that, the great Paul said: 'For us, he, being rich, was poor, so that we might be enriched by his poverty'.[180] l.30

And who was he who was rich?

What was enriched?

And how was this one poor because of us?

Let them say to us, they who divide the human being from God's word and who separate what was made one by the recollection of the natures, they who say that Christ is two (things) and for (their own) defence provide the <'one'> by rationalisation alone[181].

Therefore, tell me, who, being rich, was poor with my poverty?

Is it the one who seems to be a human being, from whom you separate the divinity?

But this (being) never became rich! l.35 He was poor, born of poor ancestors.

Then who was the rich (being) and of what was he rich, p.87 who because of us became destitute?

God, he says, enriched the creation.

Surely then God also became destitute, making his own the destitution of what is seen.

For the same (being) both enriched the divinity and became destitute because of us.

Neither would you say that the human being enriches (itself), being poor both by nature and in money, nor[, in fact,] would you say that one who enriches (the) worth of divinity is poor l.5 without attributing humanity[182] to him.

Because of this the apostle too, combining the glory of divinity to human sufferings, not wishing either to divide by rationalisation, or to separate by word what had been made one,

said that the same (being) enriched divinity, and was poor through sufferings, and was the one because of himself, and suffered the other because of us.

But if he who enriched the divinity was poor with human poverty, how did he not also suffer the rest, having once chosen to become a human being because of l.10 philanthropy?

X But enough of these things!

(I bid) you, rather, behold that poorest of dwellings of him who enriches the heaven!

[180] 2*Cor.* 8:9.

[181] ἐπινοίαι μόνηι.

[182] τὰ ἀνθρώπινα.

Behold the manger of him who sits above the cherubim![183]
Behold, swaddling-clothes of him who fettered the sea with sand![184]
Behold the poverty below, reasoning about his richness above!
For thus you would see the greatness of grace and of philanthropy, if you reason about [l.15] so great condescension of God.
Indeed, the richness of his divinity is shown in this poverty, inasmuch as the star reveals the destitute to the Magi,[185] and leads the gentiles to the manger of the destitute.
But also angels, rejoicing in this, were proclaiming the poor (being) to the shepherds, singing of his richness of divinity.[186]
Indeed, the Magi brought as a gift the incense to him who appeared as if to a god, not separating one nature of another, [l.20] and not severing the united one by rationalisation, but having once seen with wonder the God who appeared, offered incense to him, disclosing by this the divine worth.
And the angels did not separate who had been born from the divine word by rationalisations like yours,
but knowing (him to be) one and the same, and seeing and apprehending, were loudly proclaiming, saying: 'Glory to God in the highest, and peace on earth, good-will among human beings',[187]
and not, like you, saying some things [l.25] while rationalising others and admitting with words that Christ Jesus is one, yet dividing the same by rationalisation,
just as you, who have concepts which fight with the words,
but they glorify one and the same God.
Accordingly he appeared both in destitution and in a manger to everything.
Because of this, he is both in swaddling-clothes and glorified by angels <>[188]
While the star did not descend for the Magi – for stars do not interchange the places –, but since [l.30] the land of the Chaldeans has many devoted to (the) motion of the stars, the stronger power, which guided the Magi, took up (the) property of a star, in order that the Chaldeans, from what they had learnt, would learn what they did not know, and turning to astronomy, would be taught by the stars themselves the mysteries of Christ.
That it was not a star, but angelic power, guiding the gentiles towards piety, the evangelist himself reveals, saying that this star once also appeared during (the) day, [l.35] once was hidden, and he says at another time that it guided the Magi [p.88] and that it went with them to Bethlehem, which no one would say that

[183] *Cf. Pss.* 79(80):2. 98(99):1.
[184] *Cf. Jer.* 5:22.
[185] *Cf. Matt.* 2:9.
[186] *Cf. Luke* 2:13-4.
[187] *Luke* 2:14.
[188] See ACO I 1/2, 87, 28 *app. ad. loc.* on the lacuna.

any of the habitual stars[, clearly perceived[189],] does, but a power that appears to the astronomers in the shape of a star.
And what was said about the star, (that it) 'stood above the child',[190] will obviously disclose that what appeared is power.
For no particular star among those fixed in the sky [1.5] would have become clear standing above the child, since the greatness of distance, deceiving the sight's judgement, makes clear to the perception neither the stationariness nor the motion of the stars.
He says: 'The star stood above where the child was'.[191]
Surely then, the star which appeared, having left the heights, came to be nearer to the ground, in order to show by (its) stationariness the engendering of the emperor.
Indeed, the Magi were seeking (someone) as an emperor, inquiring after an emperor's birth and saying to the Jews: [1.10] 'Where is he that is born emperor of the Jews? For we saw his star in the East and came to prostrate ourselves before him.'[192]
Do you seek an emperor, Magi? Why do you offer incense as if to a God?
However, I both know an emperor and gained knowledge of a God;
because of this I offer him both gold and incense, disclosing by the gifts at once both God and emperor.

XI [1.15] But this (being), who then drew Magi with ineffable power towards piety, has now also attracted today the bright audience, when he is no longer placed in a manger, but set before on this saving altar[193].
For that manger became the mother of this altar;
because of this he is placed in the one so that on this other he may be eaten and may become saving food for the believers.
On the one hand, however, the manger displayed this splendid altar, [1.20] on the other, the virgin made these choirs of the virginity blossom;
the meanness of the cottage in Bethlehem displayed these notable shrines, while the swaddling-clothes now became the deliverances from the failures.
Did you see the accomplishments of the former destitution which have now appeared?
Did you see poverty that has come to be mother of such great richness?
(Surely,) the meanness of the only-begotten for a little (time) below, which conveyed so great a richness for the (inhabited) world, does not destroy (it)?
Then why [1.25] do you reproach Christ for the meanness in Bethlehem?

[189] δῆλον τῇ αἰσθήσει.
[190] *Matt.* 2:9, in a reading attested in some ancient manuscripts, as opposed to the predominating ἐστάθη adopted in modern editions.
[191] *Matt.* 2:9.
[192] *Matt.* 2:2.
[193] τραπέζης. *Cf.* 1*Cor.* 10:21.

Why do you adduce destitution to (our) midst, without reasoning about the profits to the world (which come) from it?
Why do you say that God's suffering, which became cause of such great good things, is unworthy?
Why do you set aside the wounds of the only-begotten, which brought forward so great a salvation to the human beings?
Why do you seat next to the sufferings and do not behold the accomplishments of the sufferings which now come about?
Why do you say that suffering is unworthy of God, by which the tyranny of the devil has been undone? l.30
Why do you say that destitution is unworthy of God, by which the world is enriched with piety?
Why do you say that death is unworthy of God, by which God spent death?
For what (reason) do you say that the cross is not God's, by which God triumphed over the evil of the devil?
Why do you say that this alone is not of God, who nailed my sin to the wood?
Do not discredit the sufferings from which the impassive (being) is born;
do not ridicule meanness through which the tyranny of the devil is dissolved;
do not reproach l.35 God (for) a buffet, through which he released the human being from sin;
do not say that a chain is unworthy of God, by which he split sin's chain of ropes;[194]
do not say that destitution is unworthy of God, because p.89 the devil, being rich in deceit, was made poor;
do not judge a cross which dissolved altars;[195]
do not disparage the nails through which Christ brought together the (inhabited) world to a single purpose of piety.
Do not reason about the mean things, but rather the accomplishments of the suffering one which have come about from these things, (accomplishments) which you would not say have come about from the mere suffering human being, inasmuch as you are mindful and are persuaded by what appears. l.5
And why do you also call mean the things which God welcomed because of the salvation of human beings?
For if sufferings[196] are and are said to be by the nature, but became (the) cure of our sufferings:
no longer then designate them sufferings, but remedy of our sufferings!

[194] *Cf. Heb.* 12:1.
[195] βωμούς.
[196] παθήματα. Theodotus employs it seven times in Homilies I and II, but uses πάθη more often.

And do not adduce to me the limbs of the virgin for a reproach of divinity.
For their nature is not unworthy also, even if the sufferings of the dishonour that followed defiled the nobility of the body.
For limbs (are) not base by the nature, but are outraged through unnatural desire.
For if they were base by the nature, God would not have plastered them with his own palms, since God is indeed not the maker of base things, but of the most beautiful ones; 'for God saw all the things, as many as he had made, and, look, very beautiful'.[197]
For none of them that came to be under God through his own nature (is) bad, nor did God prepare anything base, but we, falling from the first preparation, insulted our nature with unnatural desires.
Then, if God, who moulded the limbs of the woman, is not discredited, neither is he mocked, having dwelt in them; for God does not live unworthily in his own creation.
XII And if you say: how, leaving behind heaven, did he reside in a womb?
I will also say to you that he, being God, became a human being because of human beings, remaining God without interchanging essences[198].

For that very reason I admit the same (being is) God and man,
on the one hand, God before time,
on the other, a human being who came to be, beginning from the birth,
not two, but one,
not being declared as one, yet rationalised (as) twofold:
for it is necessary that the concept does not fight with the word.
We do not think two, and we admit a single one;
let neither word nor concept separate what was joined by dispensation and wonder.
Yet if someone would separate by rationalisation what had been joined, he would think that it had been sundered, and the concept would become false, having separated <clearly> what had always been joined.
It is then necessary to have the concept agreeing with the word.
Do you say that Christ is one, that the same (being is) God and human being? Surely then also think of one.
Yet if you say one, but rationalise two, you have the concept battling with your word.
So do not say two, separated by some difference[199].
For if you unite with words, do not sever with concepts: for if you sever with concepts, you deny union.

[197] *Gen.* 1:32.
[198] μετατεθείσης οὐσίας.
[199] διαφορά.

So do not [l.30] lead away the reasoning to separated natures, inasmuch as God works the wonder of the extreme union.
Believe the wonder and do not explore with reasonings what came to be!
Do not dissolve the wonder, being eager to find the word; for the wonder which the word makes known, does not remain.
If the word of what came to be is well-known, the fact is no longer a sign nor a wonder;
and, if it is sign and wonder, leaving behind the reasonings, recover the belief, admitting that the one Lord [p.90] Jesus Christ is the same, both God and human being, not separated either by rationalisations or reasonings,
in order that we do not, separating with reasonings the things which are united, deny the saving dispensation.
For if the union of God and human being is made known through the dispensation, he who separates the union denies the dispensation.
Let us then believe in the wonders of the dispensation,
in order that Christ, [l.5] (whom we) believe in, may present this imperial grace of heavens to those who admit, from which it may come to pass that we all succeed to the grace of Christ, to whom be glory for ever.
Amen.

A note on abbreviations and primary sources

Abbreviations

In general, titles and abbreviations follow G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (1961), for patristic literature, and H.G. Liddell *et al.* (eds), *A Greek-English Lexicon* (1996), for classical Greek sources, or follow their patterns. Besides these, the following abbreviations are used:

ACO: E. Schwartz, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum* (1914ff.);
CPG: M. Geerard (ed.), A Cyrillo Alexandrino ad Iohannem Damascenum (1979);
PG: J.P. Migne (ed.), *Patrologiae: Series Graeca* (1857-1866);
PL: J.P. Migne (ed.), *Patrologiae: Series Latina* (1844-1855);
TLG: Thesaurus Linguae Graecae, a digital library of Greek literature, University of California, Irvine: www.tlg.uci.edu.

Primary sources

Critical editions of the majority of the sources mentioned in this book can be found in ACO, and for clarity they are cited by a reference that follows the template: tome part/volume, page, line numbers (where applicable). The following list provides their titles and the number of the documents in the ancient collections (to which the *Index locorum* points). It also contains the remaining ancient sources cited in the main text, with a short reference to the editions included in the Bibliography. Except for Theodotus, authors are listed alphabetically and follow G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (1961), therefore allowing for collective authors such as '*Concilium Ephesinum anno 431*'.

Theodotus

Homilies:

I: *In die nativitatis domini* (CPG 6125): ACO I 1/2, 80-90;
II: *In die nativitatis* (CPG 6126): ACO I 1/2, 73-80;
III: *Contra Nestorium* (CPG 6127): ACO I 1/2, 71-3;
IV: *In s. deiparam et in Simeonem* (CPG 6128): PG77, 1389D-412B;
V: *In domini nostri Iesu Christi diem natalem* (CPG 6129): M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité' (1960), 224-32;
VI: *Homilia habita in ecclesia s. Iohannis* (Ethiopic) (CPG 6132): B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 122-32;

dubia:

Homilia in baptisma domini (CPG 6135): M. Aubineau, *Recherches patristiques* (1974), 100-10;
Homilia in s. deiparam et in nativitatem domini (CPG 6136): M. Jugie (ed.), *Homélies mariales* (1926), 318-35.

Treatises:

Expositio symboli Nicaeni (CPG 6124): PG77, 1313C-48D;
Contra Nestorium: British Library MS Add. 17148 , f 1-44 (unpublished).

Letter fragment:

Ex epistulae ad Vitalem monachum Cappadocem (CPG 6130): ACO I 4, 212, 10-9.

Other authors

Abelard

Logica ingredientibus – B. Geyer (ed.), *Peter Abaelards philosophische Schriften* (1919).

Acacius of Melitene

Homilia Ephesina – Coll. Vat. 74 – ACO I 1/2, 90; in *Qērellos*: B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 68-80.

Aristoteles

Ars rhetorica – W.D. Ross (ed.), *Aristotle. Ars rhetorica* (1959).

Athanasius

Oratio tertia adversus Arianos – K. Metzler *et al.* (eds), *Oratio III contra Arianos* (2000);
Epistula ad Epictetum – PG26, 1049-70.

Augustine

Confessionum libri XIII – H. Juergens *et al.* (eds), *S. Aurelii Augustini Confessionum libri XIII* (1981).

Basil of Caesarea

Homilia 14 (= *in ebriosos*) – PG31, 444-64;
Liber de Spiritu sancto – B. Pruche (ed.), *Basile de Césarée. Sur le Saint-Esprit* (1968), 250-530.

Canones

LXXXV apostolici – M. Metzger (ed.), *Les constitutions apostoliques* (1987), 275-309;
Nicaea (325) – P.P. Joannou (ed.), *Discipline générale antique* (1962-64), I/1, 22-41;
Serdica (343) – P.P. Joannou (ed.), *Discipline générale antique* (1962-64), I/2, 156-89;
Constantinople (381) – P.P. Joannou (ed.), *Discipline générale antique* (1962-64), I/1, 48-53;
Chalcedon (451) – ACO II 1/2, 158-63 (*canones* 1-27).

Cassian

De incarnatione – M. Petschenig (ed.), *Iohannis Cassiani* (1888);
De institutis coenobiorum et de octo principalium vitiorum remediis libri XII – M. Petschenig (ed.), *Iohannis Cassiani* (1888).

Celestine

Epistula ad Cyrillum – Coll. Vat. 9 – ACO I 1/1, 75-7;

Epistula ad Nestorium – *Coll. Vat.* 10 – ACO I 1/1, 77-83;
Epistula ad Constantinopolus 1 – *Coll. Vat.* 11 – ACO I 1/1, 83-90.

Chrysippus of Jerusalem
In sanctam Mariam – M. Jugie (ed.), *Homélies mariales* (1926), 336-43.

Concilium Ephesinum anno 431
Gesta Ephesi d. 22 m. Iun. a. 431 – *Coll. Vat.* 33-62 – ACO I 1/2, 3-64;
Gesta Ephesi d. 10 et 11 m. Iul. a. 431 cum epistula Caelestini ad synodum – *Coll. Vat.* 106 – ACO I 1/3, 53-63;
Gesta Ephesi d. 16 et 17 m. Iul. a. 431 – *Coll. Vat.* 87-90 – ACO I 1/3, 15-26;
Gesta Ephesi d. 22 m. Iul. a. 431 – *Coll. Ath.* 73-79 – ACO I 1/7, 84-117;
Synodi relatio ad imperatores de Nestorii damnatione – *Coll. Vat.* 81 – ACO I 1/3, 3-5;
Synodi relatio ad Caelestinum – *Coll. Vat.* 82 – ACO I 1/3, 5-9;
Synodi relatio ad imperatores destinata per Palladium – *Coll. Vat.* 84 – ACO I 1/3, 10-3;
Synodi epistula ad clerum et populum Constantinopolum de depositione Nestorii – *Coll. Vat.* 85 – ACO I 1/3, 13-4;
Synodi epistula universalis – *Coll. Vat.* 91 – ACO I 1/3, 26-8;
Synodi relatio ad imperatores de Orientalibus – *Coll. Vat.* 92 – ACO I 1/3, 28-30;
Synodi relatio ad imperatores ad sacram per Iohannem comitem sacrarum largitionum lectam – *Coll. Vat.* 94 – ACO I 1/3, 32-3;
Synodi mandatum episcopis Constantinopolim directis – *Coll. Vat.* 95 – ACO I 1/3, 33-6;
Episcoporum Constantinopoli degentium epistula ad synodum – *Coll. Vat.* 98 – ACO I 1/3, 42-3;
Synodi epistula ad episcopos Constantinopolim degentes – *Coll. Vat.* 99 – ACO I 1/3, 43-4;
Synodi petitio ad imperatores – *Coll. Vat.* 102 – ACO I 1/3, 47-8;
Narratio de Maximiani ordinatione – *Coll. Vat.* 109 – ACO I 1/3, 67;
Relatio legatorum ad imperatores – *Coll. Vat.* 108 – ACO I 1/3, 65-6; *Coll. Ath.* 59 – ACO I 1/7, 72.

Concilium orientalium Ephesini habitum anno 431
Actiones – *Coll. Vat.* 151 – ACO I 1/5, 119-24;
Gesta synodi Orientalium d.26. m. Iun. 431 – *Coll. Cas.* 87-8 – ACO I 4, 33-8;
Secunda commenta synodi quae cum Iohanne Antiocheno conuenit in Ephesum – *Coll. Cas.* 95 – ACO I 4, 43-4;
Contestatio directa beato Cyrillo – *Coll. Cas.* 82 – ACO I 4, 27-30;
Contestatio Candidiano comitis – *Coll. Cas.* 84 – ACO I 4, 31-2;
Edictum ad synodum magnificentissimi comitis – *Coll. Cas.* 86 – ACO I 4, 33;
Orientalium relatio ad imperatores – *Coll. Vat.* 153 – ACO I 1/5, 124-5;
Eorundem relatio ad augustas – *Coll. Vat.* 153 – ACO I 1/5, 131-2;
Mandatorium synodi Orientalis ad legatarios suos – *Coll. Cas.* 111 – ACO I 4, 63;
Mandatariorum Orientalium supplicatio 1-2 – *Coll. Ath.* 62-3 – ACO I 1/7, 72-5;
Mandatariorum Orientalium epistola ad illorum concilium 1-2 – *Coll. Ath.* 65-6 – ACO I 1/7, 76-7; – *Coll. Cas.* 114-5 – ACO I 4, 64-5;

Mandatariorum Orientalium epistola ad illorum concilium 3 – *Coll. Cas.* 120 – ACO I 4, 70-1;
Epistula synodi Orientalium ad legatarios – *Coll. Cas.* 116 – ACO I 4, 65-7;
Orientalium relatio ad imperatores *Coll. Cas.* 117 ACO I 4, 67-8;
Gesta Ephesi de episcopi Cypriis – *Coll. Ath.* 81 – ACO I 1/7, 118-22.

Concilium Chalcedonense anno 451
Actiones – ACO II 1, 55-469;
Canon 28 – ACO II 1/3, 88.

Concilium Constantinopolitanum anno 553
Actiones – ACO IV 1, 3-231.

Cyril of Alexandria
Homilia diversa 1 (= *Ephesi praedicata*, or *Ephesi habita, valde pulchra*) – *Coll. Vat.* 77 – ACO I 1/2, 96-8;
Homilia diversa 2 (= *Ephesi praedicata in die Joannis evangelistae* or *Ephesi habita in basilica s. Iohannis evangelistae*) – *Coll. Vat.* 76 – ACO I 1/2, 94-6; in *Qērellos*: B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 54-61;
Homilia diversa 4 (= *De Maria deipara in Nestorium*) – *Coll. Vat.* 80 – ACO I 1/2, 102-4;
Homilia diversa 5 (= *Ephesi praedicata deposito Nestorio*, or *Ephesi dicta, deposito Nestorio*) – *Coll. Vat.* 75 – ACO I 1/2, 92-4; in *Qērellos*: B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 88-99;
Homilia diversa 6 (= *In Joannem Antiochenum*, or *Ephesi dicta in Iohannem Antiochenum*) – *Coll. Vat.* 78 – ACO I 1/2, 98-100; in *Qērellos*: B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 108-17;
Homilia diversa 7 (= *Ephesi praedicata [/dicta] priusquam a comite comprehenderetur*) – *Coll. Vat.* 79 – ACO I 1/2, 100-2;
Ephesi dicta in maiore ecclesia, quae vocatur Mariae – ACO I 3, 143, 28-31;
Homilia paschalis 8 (= *Epistula paschalis* 8) – W.H. Burns *et al.* (eds), *Cyrille d'Alexandrie. Lettres Festales 7–11* (1993);
Epistula 1 (= *Ad monachos Aegypti*) – *Coll. Vat.* 1 – ACO I 1/1, 10-23;
Epistula 4 (= *Ad Nestorium*) – *Coll. Vat.* 4 – ACO I 1/1, 25-8;
Epistula 11 (= *Ad Caelestinum*) – *Coll. Vat.* 144 – ACO I 1/5, 10-2;
Epistula 17 (= *Ad Nestorium*) – *Coll. Vat.* 6 – ACO I 1/1, 33-42;
Epistula 19 (= *Ad monachos Constantinopolitanos*) – *Coll. Vat.* 145 – ACO I 1/5, 12-3;
Epistula 23 (= *Epistula ad Comarium et Potamonem episcopos [episcoporum Constantinopoli consistentium commonitorium]*) – *Coll. Vat.* 67 – ACO I 1/2, 66-8;
Epistula 24 (= *Ad clerum populumque Alexandrinum*) – *Coll. Vat.* 28 – ACO I 1/1, 117-8;
Epistula 31 (= *Ad Maximianum Constantinopolitanum*) – *Coll. Vat.* 115 – ACO I 1/3, 72-4;
Epistula 33 (= *Ad Acacium Berocensem*) – *Coll. Ath.* 107 – ACO I 1/7, 147-50;
Epistula 39 (= *Ad Iohannem Antiochenum*) – *Coll. Vat.* 127 – ACO I 1/4, 15-20;
Epistula 44 (= *Commonitorium ad Eulogium presbyteros*) – *Coll. Vat.* 132 – ACO I 1/4, 35-7;
Epistula 45 (= *Epistula ad Succensum I*) – *Coll. Vat.* 171 – ACO I 1/6, 151-7;
Epistula 46 (= *Epistula ad Succensum II*) – *Coll. Vat.* 172 – ACO I 1/6, 157-62;

Epistula 55 (= *De Symbolo*) – *Coll. Vat.* 135 – ACO I 1/4, 49-61;
Epistula 68 (= *Ad Acacium Melitenum*) – *Coll. Cas.* 303 – ACO I 4, 231-2;
Epistula 83 (= *Epistula ad Calosyrium*) – P.E. Pusey (ed.), *Cyrilli Epistolae* (1875), 603-7;
Libellus – *Coll. Vat.* 88 – ACO I 1/3, 15-7;
De recta fide ad Theodosium – *Coll. Vat.* 7 – ACO I 1/1, 42-72;
De recta fide ad Pulcheriam et Eudociam – *Coll. Vat.* 149 – ACO I 1/5, 26-61;
Oratio ad dominas, or *De recta fide ad Arcadiam et Marinam* – *Coll. Vat.* 150 – ACO I 1/5, 26-61;
Apologeticus ad imperatorem Theodosium – *Coll. Vat.* 119 – ACO I 1/3, 75-90;
De incarnatione – *Coll. Vat.* 140 – ACO I 1/5, 3-4;
Explicatio duodecim capitum – *Coll. Vat.* 148 – ACO I 1/5, 15-25;
Duodecim capitum defensio adversus orientales episcopos – *Coll. Ath.* 24 – ACO I 1/7, 33-65;
Contra Nestorium – *Coll. Vat.* 166 – ACO I 1/6, 13-106;
Quod unus sit Christus (= *Chr. un.*) – G.-M. de Durand (ed.), *Cyrille d'Alexandrie. Deux dialogues Christologiques* (1964), 302-515; in *Qērellos*: B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 3 (1977), 31-238;
Glaphyra in Pentateuchum – PG69, 9-678;
Scholia de incarnatione – P.E. Pusey (ed.), *Cyrilli Epistolae* (1875), 498-579; *excerpta Parisina* 1 – ACO I 5/1, 219-31;
Commentarii in Joannem – P.E. Pusey (ed.), *Cyrilli in D. Joannis Evangelium* (1872);
De trinitate dialogi – G.-M. de Durand (ed.), *Cyrille d'Alexandrie. Dialogues sur la Trinité* (1976-8);
Thesaurus de sancta consubstantiali trinitate – PG75, 9-656;
De trinitate (sp.) – PG77, 1120-73.

Epiphanius of Salamis (Constantiensis)
Panarion (= *Adversus haereses*) – K. Holl (ed.), *Epiphanius* (1985) volume 3.
Symbolum – B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.2 (1979), 26-47.
Homilia – B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.2 (1979), 52-8.

Eusebius of Caesarea
Historia ecclesiastica – E. Schwartz and T. Mommsen (eds), *Eusebius Caesariensis Werke. Die Kirchengeschichte* (1903, 1908);
Epistula ad Caesarienses – H.-G. Opitz (ed.), *Athanasius Werke* (1935), 28-31 (in *Athanasius decr.*).
De vita Constantini – F. Winkelmann (ed.), *Eusebius Werke: 1. Bd., 1. T.* (1975).

Eusebius of Dorylaeum
Contestatio – *Coll. Vat.* 18 – ACO I 1/1, 101-2.

Eusebius of Herakleia
Homilia – B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 134-7.

Evagrius Ponticus
Peri logismon – P. Géhin *et al.* (eds), *Evagre le Pontique. Sur les pensées* (1998).

Firmus
Homilia – B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 134-7.

Gregory of Nazianzus
Oratio 39 – C. Moreschini and P. Gallay (eds), *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 38-41* (1990), 150-97.

Gregory of Nyssa
Homilia 2 *in Ecclesiasten* – W.W. Jaeger *et al.* (eds), *Gregorii Nysseni opera* (1952ff.) 5, 299-314;
Oratio catechetica magna – J.H. Srawley (ed.), *The Catechetical Oration* (1903);
Adversus Macedonianos de spiritu sancto – W.W. Jaeger *et al.* (eds), *Gregorii Nysseni opera* (1952ff.) 3/1, 89-105.

Gregory the Great
Regula pastoralis – B. Judic *et al.* (eds), *Grégoire le Grand. Règle pastorale* (1992).

Hippolytus
Contra haeresin Noeti – R. Butterworth (ed.), *Hippolytus of Rome. Contra Noetum* (1977), 43-93.

Jerome
Epistula 92 (*Theophilus, synodica epistula*) – I. Hilberg (ed.), *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae* (1996), 147-55;
Adversus Rufinum – P. Lardet (ed.), *Saint Jérôme. Apologie contre Rufin* (1983).

John of Antioch
Epistula ad Nestorium – *Coll. Vat.* 14 – ACO I 1/1, 93-6;
Epistula ad Cyrillum 1 – *Coll. Vat.* 30 – ACO I 1/1, 119;
Epistula ad Cyrillum 2 *(de pace)* – *Coll. Vat.* 123 – ACO I 1/4, 7-9;
Epistula ad Cyrillum 4 – *Coll. Ath.* 118 – ACO I 1/7, 155;
Epistula ad Antiochum praef. praet. ab Ancyra – *Coll. Cas.* 127 – ACO I 4, 79-80;
Epistula ad Alexandrum episcopum Hierapolis – *Coll. Cas.* 139 – ACO I 4, 91;
Relatio ad imperatorem seu imperatores seu imperatrices 5 – *Coll. Vat.* 154 – ACO I 1/5, 37-9;
Homilia – *Coll. Ath.* 72 – ACO I 1/7, 84.

John of Damascus
Sacra parallela – PG95, 1040 - PG96, 544.

John Rufus
Vita Petri Iberi – C.B. Horn and R. Phenix (eds), *John Rufus: the Lives* (2008).

Juvenal of Jerusalem
Homilia Ephesina – B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 82-6.

Leo the Great
Tomus ad Flavianum episcopum (= *Epistula* 28) – ACO II 2/1, 24-33; ACO II 1/1, 10-20.

Leontius of Byzantium
Contra Nestorianus et Eutychianus – PG86 1, 1267-398.

Martyrii Theodotii
Martyrii Theodotii 1 – P.F. de' Cavalieri (ed.), *I martirii di S.Teodoto e di S. Ariadne* (1901), 61-84;
Martyrii Theodotii 2 – *ibid.*, 85-7.

Memnon of Ephesus
Epistula ad clerum Constantinopolitanum – *Coll. Vat.* 101 – ACO I 1/3, 46-7.

Nestorius
Homilia IV (de incarnatione) – F. Loofs (ed.), *Nestoriana* (1905), 296ff;
Homilia – *Coll. Pal.* 22 – ACO I 5/1, 37-9;
Epistula ad Cyrillum 1 – *Coll. Vat.* 3 – ACO I 1/1, 25;
Epistula ad Cyrillum 2 – *Coll. Vat.* 5 – ACO I 1/1, 29-32;
Ex lib. qui vocatur Tragoedia – *Coll. Cas.* 81 – ACO I 4, 25-7;
Epistula ad Theodosium – *Coll. Vat.* 146 – ACO I 1/5, 13-5; *Coll. Cas.* 83 – ACO I 4, 30-1;
Epistula praefecti praetorio ad Nestorium, ut cum honore ad suum monasterium remaneret, unde ad episcopatum fuerat euocatus – *Coll. Cas.* 112 – ACO I 4, 64;
Liber Heraclides – P. Bedjan (ed.), *Le livre d'Héraclide de Damas* (1910); translations: F. Nau (ed.), *Le Livre d'Héraclide de Damas* (1910); G.R. Driver (ed.), *The Bazaar of Heracleides* (1925);
Anonymous Syriac hagiography – N. Brière, 'La légende syriaque de Nestorius' (1910), 1-16.

Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopulus
Historia ecclesiastica – PG145-7;
Antirrhetica – J.-B. Pitra, *Spicilegium solesmense* (1852).

Nilus of Ancyra
Oratio in Albianum – PG79, 696-712.

Palladius of Aspuna (Monachus)
Historia Lausiaca – PG34, 995-1260.

Photius of Constantinople
Bibliothecae codices – R. Henry (ed.), *Photius. Bibliothèque I* (1959), id., *Photius. Bibliothèque IV* (1965), *id.*, *Photius. Bibliothèque V* (1967).

Plato
Protagoras – J. Burnet (ed.), *Platonis opera* (1968) 3;
Respublica – J. Burnet (ed.), *Platonis opera* (1968) 4.

Proclus
Homilia 1 – *Coll. Vat.* 19 – ACO I 1/1, 103-7;

Homilia 4 – N. Constas, *Proclus* (2003), 226-36;
Tomus ad Armenios – ACO IV 2, 187-95.

Ps.-Macarius
Homiliae spirituales 50 (collectio H) – H. Dörries *et al.* (eds), *Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios* (1964).

Rheginus
Sermo Ephesi habitus – Coll. Vat. 70 – ACO I 1/2, 70; B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 100-7.

Severus of Antioch
Liber contra impium grammaticum – J. Lebon, *Severi Antiocheni Liber contra impium grammaticum* (1929, 1933, 1938);
Orationes ad Nephalium – J. Lebon, *Severi Antiocheni Orationes ad Nephalium* (1949).

Severus of Synada
Homilia Ephesina – B.M. Weischer, Qērellos 4.1 (1979), 62-6.

Socrates Scholasticus
Historia ecclesiastica – P. Périchon and P. Maraval (eds), *Socrate de Constantinople. Histoire ecclésiastique* (2004-7) I, 107; II, 180.

Sozomen
Historia ecclesiastica – J. Bidez and C. Hansen (eds), *Sozomen. Kirchengeschichte* (1960).

Theodore of Mopsuestia
Contra Eunomium – L. Abramowski and A.E. Goodman (eds), *A Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts* (1972).

Theodoret of Cyrrhus
Epistula CXII – Y. Azéma (ed.), *Théodoret de Cyr. Correspondance* (1965), 50-1;
Epistula ad Alexandrum episcopum Hierapolis – Coll. Ath. 69 – ACO I 1/7, 79-80; *Coll. Cas.* 119 – ACO I 4, 69-70;
Homilia Chalcedoni habita – Coll. Ath. 71 – ACO I 1/7, 82-3;
Historia ecclesiastica – L. Parmentier and F. Scheidweiler (eds), *Theodoret. Kirchengeschichte* (1954).

Theodosius II
Codex Theodosianum – T. Mommsen and P.M. Meyer (eds), *Theodosiani libri XVI* (1905);
Epistula ad Cyrillum 1 – Coll. Vat. 8 – ACO I 1/1, 73-4;
Epistula ad Cyrillum 2 – Coll. Vat. 25 – ACO I 1/1, 114-6;
Sacra ad synodum Ephesinam (431) missa – Coll. Vat. 31 – ACO I 1/1, 120-1;
Epistula scripta ad concilium Ephesinum (431) per Palladium – Coll. Vat. 83 – ACO I 1/3, 9-10;

Sacra per Iohannem comitem sacrarum largitionum destinata – *Coll. Vat.* 93 – ACO I 1/3, 31-2;
Constitutio ad Isidorum scripta de relegatione Nestorii – *Coll. Vat.* 110 – ACO I 1/3, 67;
Edictum praefectorum praetorio – *Coll. Vat.* 112 – ACO I 1/3, 69-70;
Epistula ad Joannem Antiochenum – *Coll. Vat.* 120 – ACO I 1/4, 3-4;
Epistula ad concilium Ephesinum – *Coll. Cas.* 118 – ACO I 4, 68-9;
Epistula ad concilium Ephesenum concilium dissoluendum – *Coll. Ath.* 97 – ACO I 1/7, 142.

Bibliography

Abramowski, Luise, *Untersuchungen zum Liber Heraclidis des Nestorius*, Corpus scriptorum Christianorum orientalium 242, 22, Subsidia (Louvain, 1963).

—, 'Die Sitzung des Konzils von Ephesus am 22. Juli 431. "Über die Befestigung des Symbols der heiligen Väter in Nicäa und über den vom Presbyter Charisius übergebenen Libellus"' *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 115 (2004), 382-90.

—, 'Der Bischof von Seleukia-Ktesiphon als Katholikos und Patriarch der Kirche des Ostens', in D. Bumazhnov *et al.* (eds), *Syrien im 1.-7. Jahrhundert* (2011), 1-56.

Abramowski, Luise and Alan Edward Goodman (eds), *A Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts: Cambridge University Library MS Oriental 1319*, University of Cambridge oriental publications 18-9 (Cambridge, 1972).

Adams, J. N., Mark Janse and Simon Swain (eds), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text* (Oxford, 2002).

Aland, Barbara, Johannes Hahn and Christian Ronning (eds), *Literarische Konstituierung von Identifikationsfiguren in der Antike*, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 16 (Tübingen, 2003).

Allen, Pauline, 'Homilies as a source for social history', *Studia Patristica* 24 (1993) 1-5.

—, *Sophronius of Jerusalem and Seventh-century Heresy: The Synodical Letter and other Documents – Introduction, Texts, Translations, and Commentary,* Oxford early Christian texts (Oxford, 2009).

—, 'Episcopal succession in Antioch in the sixth century', in J. Leemans *et al.* (eds), *Episcopal Elections* (2011), 23-38.

—, 'Prolegomena to a study of the letter-bearer in Christian antiquity', *Studia Patristica* 62 (2013) 481-92.

Allen, Pauline and Wendy Mayer, 'Computer and homily: accessing the everyday life of early Christians', *Vigiliae Christianae* 47 (1993), 260-80.

Aubenque, Pierre (ed.), *Concepts et catégories dans la pensée antique*, Bibliothèque d'histoire de la philosophie (Paris, 1980).

Aubineau, Michel, 'Une homélie de Théodote d'Ancyre sur la nativité du Seigneuer', *OCP* 26 (1960) 224-32.

—, 'Une homélie grecque inédite attribuée à Théodote d'Ancyre sur le baptême du seigneur', in *Diakonia pisteos. Melanges J.A. de Aldama*, Biblioteca teologica Granadina 13 (Granada, 1969), 6-30.

—, *Recherches patristiques: enquêtes sur des manuscrits, textes inédits, études* (Amsterdam, 1974).

—, 'Un recueil de textes «Chrysostomiens», notamment d'homélies pascales. Le Codex Pharmakidi 22 (s. XVI)', *Μεσαιωνικα* 3 (1990), 387-95.

Auksi, Peter, *Christian Plain Style: the Evolution of a Spiritual Ideal* (Montreal, 1995).

Ayres, Lewis and Gareth Jones (eds), *Christian Origins: Theology, Rhetoric, and Community* (London, 1998).

Azéma, Yvan (ed.), *Théodoret de Cyr. Correspondance, III – Epist. Sirm. 96-147*, Sources chrétiennes 111 (Paris, 1965).

Banev, Krastu Krassimirov, *Pastoral polemics: a rhetorical analysis of Theophilus of Alexandria's Letters in the First Origenist Controversy,* PhD thesis, University of Cambridge. Faculty of Divinity (Cambridge, February 2008).

Bardenhewer, Otto, *Das fünfte Jahrhundert mit Einschluss der syrischen Literatur des vierten Jahrhunderts*, Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur 4, 1st and 2nd edition (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1923).

—, (ed.), *Marienpredigten aus der Väterzeit* (München, 1934).

Barkhuizen, Jan Harm, 'Proclus of Constantinople, Homily 1: A perspective on his Christology', *Patristic and Byzantine Review* 13 (1994), 49-63.

—, 'Proclus of Constantinople: a popular preacher in fifth-century Constantinople', in M. Cunningham and P. Allen (eds), *Preacher and Audience* (1998), 179-200.

—, *Proclus, Bishop of Constantinople – Homilies on the Life of Christ* (Brisbane, 2001).

Barnes, Michel R. and Daniel Harrison Williams (eds), *Arianism after Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts* (Edinburgh, 1993).

Barnes, Timothy David, 'The crimes of Basil of Ancyra', *Journal of Theological Studies*, N.S. 47 (1996), 550-4.

Batiffol, Pierre, 'Les présents de saint Cyrille à la cour de Constantinople', in *Études de liturgie et d'archéologie chrétienne* (Paris, 1919), 154-79.

Baun, Jane, *Tales from another Byzantium: Celestial Journey and Local Community in the Medieval Greek Apocrypha* (Cambridge, 2007).

Bautz, Friedrich Wilhelm and Traugott Bautz (eds), 'Stoss, Veit bis Tiefenthaler, Joseph', *Biographisch-bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon* 11 (Hamm, 1996).

Beatrice, Pier Franco, *Anonymi Monophysitae theosophia: an attempt at reconstruction*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 56 (Leiden, 2001).

Becker, Adam H., *Fear of God and the Beginning of Wisdom: the School of Nisibis and Christian Scholastic Culture in Late Antique Mesopotamia*, Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion (Philadelphia, 2006).

Bedjan, Paul (ed.), *Le livre d'Héraclide de Damas* (Paris, 1910).

Beeley, Christopher A., 'Cyril of Alexandria and Gregory Nazianzen: Tradition and complexity in patristic christology', *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 17 (2009), 381-419.

Belke, Klaus, Ewald Kislinger, *et al.* (eds), *Byzantina Mediterranea: Festschrift für Johannes Koder zum 65. Geburtstag* (Wien, 2007).

Bidez, Joseph and Christian Hansen (eds), *Sozomen. Kirchengeschichte*, Die Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte 50 (Berlin, 1960).

Biville, Frederique, 'The Graeco-Romans and Graeco-Latin: a terminological framework for cases of bilingualism', in J.N. Adams *et al.* (eds), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society* (2002), 77-102.

Blaudeau, Philippe, *Alexandrie et Constantinople, 451-491: de l'histoire à la géo-ecclésiologie*, Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome (Rome, 2006).

Boulnois, Marie-Odile, 'The mystery of the Trinity according to Cyril of Alexandria: The Deployment of the Triad and its recapitulation into the Unity of Divinity', in T.G. Weinandy and D.A. Keating (eds), *The Theology of St. Cyril* (2003), 75-111.

Bowersock, Glen Warren, Peter Robert Lamont Brown and Oleg Grabar, *Late Antiquity: a Guide to the Postclassical World*, Harvard University Press reference library (Cambridge, Mass., 1999).

Brakke, David, *Demons and the Making of the Monk: Spiritual Combat in Early Christianity* (Cambridge, Mass., 2006).

Brent, Allen, 'Diogenes Laertius and the apostolic succession', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 44 (1993), 367-89.

—, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church in the Third Century: Communities in Tension Before the Emergence of a Monarch-bishop*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 31 (Leiden, 1995).

Brière, Maurice, 'La légende syriaque de Nestorius', *Revue de l'Orient chrétien* 15 (1910), 1-25.

Brock, Sebastian P., *From Ephrem to Romanos: Interactions between Syriac and Greek in Late Antiquity*, Variorum collected studies series 664 (Aldershot, 1999).

Brown, Peter, *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire*, 1988 Curti Lecture Series (Madison, Wis., 1992).

—, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*, Columbia classics in religion (New York; Chichester, 2008).

Brubaker, Leslie, 'The conquest of space', in R. Macrides (ed.), *Travel in the Byzantine World* (2002), 235-57.

Bumazhnov, Dmitrij, Hans Reinhard Seeliger and Horn, Cornelia B. (eds), *Syrien im 1.-7. Jahrhundert nach Christus: Akten der 1. Tübinger Tagung zum Christlichen Orient (15.-16. Juni 2007)*, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 62 (Tübingen, 2011).

Burnet, John (ed.), *Platonis opera*, Scriptorum classicorum bibliotheca Oxoniensis (Oxford, 1968).

Burns, W.H., Louis Arragon, Pierre Évieux and Robert Monier (eds), *Cyrille d'Alexandrie. Lettres Festales 7-11*, Sources chrétiennes 392 (Paris, 1993).

Butterworth, Robert (ed.), *Hippolytus of Rome. Contra Noetum* (London, 1977).

Caillet, Jean-Pierre, 'La transformation en église d'édifices publics et de temples à la fin de l'Antiquité', in Claude Lepelley (ed.), *La fin de la cité antique et le début de la cité medievale de la fin du IIIe siècle a l'avènement de Charlemagne. Actes du colloque tenu à l'Université de Paris X-Nanterre les 1, 2 et 3 avril 1993*, Munera. Studi storici sulla Tarda Antichità 8 (Bari, 1996), 191-211.

Cain, Andrew and Noel Emmanuel Lenski (eds), *The Power of Religion in Late Antiquity* (Farnham, 2009).

Cameron, Alan, 'Vergil illustrated between Pagans and Christians: Reconsidering "the late-4th c. Classical Revival", the dates of the manuscripts, and the places of production of the Latin Classics [Review discussions]', *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 17 (2004), 502.

Cameron, Averil, 'How to read heresiology', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 33 (2003), 471-92.

Cameron, Averil and Stuart George Hall (eds), *Eusebius. Life of Constantine*, Clarendon ancient history series (Oxford, 1999).

Cancik, Hubert and Helmuth Schneider, *Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike. Das klassische Altertum und seine Rezeptionsgeschichte* (Stuttgart, 1996-2003).

Caramboula, Dimitra, 'Die Reichsidee zur Zeit Diokletians', in K. Belke *et al.* (eds), *Byzantina Mediterranea* (2007), 283-93.

Caro, Roberto, *La homilética mariana griega en el siglo V*, Marian Library studies, new ser. 3-4 (Dayton, Ohio, 1972).

Carruthers, Mary Jean, *The Craft of Thought: Meditation, Rhetoric, and the Making of Images, 400-1200*, Cambridge studies in medieval literature 34 (Cambridge, 1998).

Cassingena-Trévedy, François, 'Les Églises syriaques à travers l'hymnographie d'Éphrem: théologie, typologie, réalité', in M.-A. Vannier (ed.), *Pères et la naissance de l'ecclésiologie* (2009), 235-59.

Castro, Giovanni Lo, 'Osservazioni su un'omelia greca sul battesimo confrontata con omelie di Teodoto d'Ancira', *Orpheus* 13 (1992), 295-314.

—, 'Citazione di uno Ps.-Teodoto d'Ancira nel florilegio greco «Doctrina patrum de incarnatione Verbi»', *Orpheus* 13 (1992), 364-8.

—, *Teodoto di Ancira: Omelie cristologiche e mariane*, Collana di testi patristici 97 (Roma, 1992).

—, *Cirillo di Alessandria: Epistole cristologiche*, Collana di testi patristici (Roma, 1999).

Chrysos, Evangelos K., 'Die Akten des Konzils von Konstantinopel I (381)', in Gerhard Wirth, Karl-Heinz Schwarte, Johannes Heinrichs (eds), *Romanitas - Christianitas: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Literatur der römischen Kaiserzeit; Johannes Straub zum 70. Geburtstag am 18. Oktober 1982 gewidmet* (Berlin, 1982), 426-35.

—, 'Konzilsakten und Konzilsprotokolle vom 4. bis 7. Jahrhundert', *Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum. Internationale Zeitschrift für Konziliengeschichtsforschung Augsburg* 15 (1983), 30-40.

Clark, Elizabeth Ann, *The Origenist Controversy: the Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*, (Princeton, N.J.; Oxford, 1992).

Coakley, Sarah, 'Does Kenosis Rest on a Mistake? Three Kenotic models in Patristic exegesis', in C.S. Evans (ed.), *Exploring Kenotic Christology* (2006), 246-64.

Combefis, François, *Theodoti Ancyrani, Adversus Nestorium, liber; id est, ejus, ex Scriptura et fide Concilii Nicaeni confutatio. S. Germani in S. Mariae dormitionem et translationem, oratio historica. Franciscus Combefis Latio reddidit, castigavit, notis illustravit* (Paris, 1675).

Constas, Nicholas, *Proclus of Constantinople and the Cult of the Virgin in Late Antiquity: Homilies 1-5, texts and translations*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 66 (Leiden, 2003).

Cooper, Kate, 'Contesting the Nativity: Wives, virgins, and Pulcheria's imitatio Mariae', *Scottish Journal of Religious Studies* 19 (1998), 31-43.

—, 'Empress and Theotokos: Gender and Patronage in the Christological Controversy', in R.N. Swanson (ed.), *The Church and Mary* (2004), 39-51.

Corrigan, Kevin, *Evagrius and Gregory: Mind, Soul, and Body in the Fourth Century*, Ashgate studies in philosophy and theology in late antiquity (Farnham, 2009).

Crabbe, Anna M., 'The invitation list to the council of Ephesus and metropolitan hierarchy in the fifth century', *The journal of theological studies*, N.S. 32 (1981), 369-400.

Cribiore, Raffaella, *The School of Libanius in Late Antique Antioch* (Princeton, 2007).

Crusé, Christian Frederic, *The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius Pamphilus, Bishop of Cesarea, in Palestine* (London, 1851).

Cunningham, Mary B., 'Preaching and the community', in R. Morris (ed.), *Church and People* (1990), 29-47.

—, 'Polemic and exegesis: anti-Judaic invective in Byzantine homiletics', *Sobornost* 21(1999), 46-68.

—, 'Dramatic device or didactic tool? The function of dialogue in Byzantine preaching', in E. Jeffreys (ed.), *Rhetoric in Byzantium* (2003), 101-13.

Cunningham, Mary and Pauline Allen (eds), *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics*, A new history of the sermon 1 (Leiden, 1998).

Dam, Raymond Van, 'Bishops and clerics during the fourth century: Numbers and their implications', in J. Leemans *et al.* (eds), *Episcopal Elections* (2011), 217-42.

de' Cavalieri, Pio Franchi (ed.), *I martirii di S.Teodoto e di S. Ariadne, con un' appendice sul testo originale del martirio di S. Eleuterio*, Studi e testi (Biblioteca apostolica vaticana) 6 (Roma, 1901).

de Halleux, André, 'Les douze chapitres cyrilliens au concile d'Ephèse (430-433)', *Revue théologique de Louvain* 23 (1992), 425-58.

—, 'La première session du concile d'Ephèse (22 juin 431)', *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 69 (1993), 48-87.

Dennis, George T., 'Perils of the deep', in C. Sode and S. Takács (eds), *Novum Millennium* (2001), 81-8.

Dillmann, August, *Chrestomathia Aethiopica: edita et glossario explanata ab Augusto Dillmann* (Leipzig, 1866).

DiTommaso, Lorenzo and Lucian Turcescu (eds), *The Reception and Interpretation of the Bible in Late Antiquity: Proceedings of the Montréal Colloquium in Honour of Charles Kannengiesser, 11-13 October 2006*, Bible in ancient Christianity 6 (Leiden, 2008).

Döpp, Siegmar and Wilhelm Geerlings (eds), *Dictionary of Early Christian Literature* (New York, 2000).

Dörnemann, Michael, *Krankheit und Heilung in der Theologie der frühen Kirchenväter*, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 20 (Tübingen, 2003).

Dörries, Hermann, Erich Klostermann and Matthias Kroeger (eds), *Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, Patristische Texte und Studien 4 (Berlin, 1964).

Driver, Godfrey Rolles, *The Bazaar of Heracleides* (Oxford, 1925).

Dunn, Geoffrey, 'Aristotle and the art of preaching', *Worship* 72 (1998), 220-35.

Durand, Georges-Matthieu de, *Cyrille d'Alexandrie. Deux dialogues Christologiques*, Sources chrétiennes 97 (Paris, 1964).

—, *Cyrille d'Alexandrie. Dialogues sur la Trinité*, Sources chrétiennes 231, 237, 246 (Paris, 1976-8).

Eisenberger, Herbert (ed.), *Hermēneumata: Festschrift für Hadwig Hörner zum sechzigsten Geburtstag*, Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften n.F., 2. Reihe 79 (Heidelberg, 1990).

Elm, Susanna, 'The dog that did not bark: Doctrine and patriarchal authority in the conflict between Theophilus of Alexandria and John Chrysostom of Constantinople', in L. Ayres and G. Jones (eds), *Christian Origins* (1998), 68-93.

Erismann, Christophe, 'A world of hypostases. John of Damascus' rethinking of Aristotle's categorical ontology', *Studia Patristica* 50 (2011), 269-87.

Euringer, Sebastian, 'Übersetzung der Homilien des Cyrillus von Alexandrien, des Severus von Synnada und des Theodotus von Ancyra in Dillmanns "Chrestomathia Aethiopica"', *Orientalia* 12 (1943), 113-34.

Evans, C. Stephen (ed.), *Exploring Kenotic Christology: the Self-emptying of God* (Oxford, 2006).

Fabricius, Johann Albert, Gottlieb Christoph Harless and Christoph August Heumann, *Ioannis Alberti Fabricii, Theol. D. et prof. publ. Hamburg Bibliotheca Graeca,*

sive, Notitia scriptorum veterum Graecorum quorumcumque monumenta integra aut fragmenta edita exstant tum plerorumque e mss. ac deperditis ab auctore tertium recognita et plurimis locis aucta 9 (Hamburg, 1804).

Fairbairn, Donald, *Grace and Christology in the Early Church*. Oxford early Christian studies (Oxford, 2003).

Fassler, Margot, 'The first Marian feast in Constantinople and Jerusalem: chant texts, readings, and homiletic literature', in K. Levy and P. Jeffery (eds), *The Study of Medieval Chant* (2001), 25-87.

Ferguson, Everett, Michael P. McHugh and Frederick W. Norris, *Encyclopedia of early Christianity*, Garland reference library of the humanities 1839, 2nd ed. (New York, 1997).

Festugière, Andrè Jean, *Ephèse et Chalcédoine: actes des conciles* (Paris, 1982).

Finn, Richard Damian, *Asceticism in the Graeco-Roman World*, Key themes in ancient history (Cambridge, 2009).

Flower, Richard, 'Genealogies of unbelief: Epiphanius of Salamis and heresiological authority', in C. Kelly *et al.* (eds), *Unclassical Traditions* (2011), 70-87.

Förster, Hans, 'Die älteste marianische Antiphon - eine Fehldatierung? – Überlegungen zum "ältesten Beleg" des *Sub tuum praesidium*', *Journal of Coptic Studies* 7 (2005) 99-109.

Foss, Clive, 'Late antique and Byzantine Ankara', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 31 (1977), 27-87.

Fraisse-Coué, Christianne, 'Le débat théologique au temps de Théodose II: Nestorius', in C. Pietri *et al.* (eds), *Naissance d'une chrétienté (250-430)* (1995), 499-550.

Frenkel, Luise Marion, 'Preaching at the Council of Ephesus (431)', *Studia Patristica* 52 (2012), 285-94.

—, 'What are sermons doing in the Proceedings of a Council? The case of Ephesus 431', *Studia Patristica* 62 (2013), 363-70.

—, '"Dear prefect, Stop the ill rumour!" – John of Antioch's tactics to counter Cyrillian propaganda after the Council of Ephesus I', *Studia Patristica* (2014).

Fuhrer, Therese (ed.), *Die christlich-philosophischen Diskurse der Spätantike: Texte, Personen, Institutionen: Akten der Tagung vom 22.-25. Februar 2006 am Zentrum für Antike und Moderne der Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg*, Philosophie der Antike 28 (Stuttgart, 2008).

Galatariotou, Catia, 'Travel and perception in Byzantium', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 47 (1993), 221-41.

Gallandi, Andreas, *Bibliotheca veterum patrum antiquorumque scriptorum ecclesiasticorum* 9 (Venice, 1773).

Geerard, Maurice (ed.), *A Cyrillo Alexandrino ad Iohannem Damascenum*, Corpus Christianorum: Clavis Patrum Graecorum 3 (Turnhout, 1979).

Géhin, Paul, Claire Guillaumont and Antoine Guillaumont (eds), *Evagre le Pontique. Sur les pensées*, Sources chrétiennes 438 (Paris, 1998).

Gemeinhardt, Peter, *Das lateinische Christentum und die antike pagane Bildung*, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 4 (Tübingen, 2007).

Gemeinhardt, Peter (ed.), *Athanasius Handbuch* (Tübingen, 2011).

Gemeinhardt, Peter and Katharina Heyden (eds), *Heilige, Heiliges und Heiligkeit in spätantiken Religionskulturen*, Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 61 (Berlin, 2012).

Gerber, Simon. *Theodor von Mopsuestia und das Nicänum: Studien zu den katechetischen Homilien*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 51 (Leiden, 2000).

Geyer, Bernhard, *Peter Abaelards philosophische Schriften: zum ersten Male hrsg. von Bernhard Geyer*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters. Texte und Untersuchungen 21 (Münster i.W., 1919).

Gharib, Georges *et al.*, *Padri e altri autori greci*, Testi mariani del primo millennio 1, 2nd ed. (Roma, 2001).

Gleede, Benjamin, *The Development of the Term ἐνυπόστατος from Origen to John of Damascus*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 113 (Leiden, 2012).

Graf, Georg, 'Zwei dogmatische Florilegien der Kopten', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 3 (1937), 345-402.

—, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur I*, Studi e testi 118 (Città del Vaticano, 1944).

Graumann, Thomas, *Die Kirche der Väter: Vätertheologie und Väterbeweis in den Kirchen des Ostens bis zum Konzil von Ephesus (431)*, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 118 (Tübingen, 2002).

—, 'Kirchliche Identität und bischöfliche Selbstinszenierung. Der Rückgriff auf 'Athanasius' bei der Überwindung des nachephesinischen Schismas und in Kyrills Propaganda', in B. Aland *et al.* (eds), *Literarische Konstituierung von Identifikationsfiguren* (2003), 195-213.

—, 'Review of *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy. The making of a saint and of a heretic.* By Susan Wessel', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 58 (2007), 114-7.

—, '"Reading" the First Council of Ephesus (431)', in R. Price and M. Whitby (eds), *Chalcedon in Context* (2009), 27-44.

—, 'Protokollierung, Aktenerstellung und Dokumentation am Beispiel des Konzils von Ephesus (431)', *Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum* 42 (2010), 7-34.

—, 'Towards the reception of the Council of Ephesus (431): public sentiment and early theological responses', *Studia Patristica* 45 (2010), 47-162.

Gregory, Timothy E., *Vox Populi: Popular Opinion and Violence in the Religious Controversies of the Fifth Century A.D.* (Columbus, 1979).

Grillmeier, Alois, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1979).

—, 'Die anthropologisch-christologische Sprache des Leontius von Byzanz und ihre Beziehung zu den Symmikta Zetemata des Neuplatonikers Porphyrius', in H. Eisenberger (ed.), *Hermēneumata* (1990), 61-72.

Grillmeier, Alois and Theresia Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, 3rd ed. (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1990).

Guillaumont, Antoine and Claire Guillaumont (eds), *Evagre le Pontique. Traité pratique ou Le moine*, Sources chrétiennes 170-171 (Paris, 1971).

Haas, Christopher, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict*, Ancient society and history (Baltimore, London, 2006).

Hadot, Pierre, 'Sur divers sens du mot PRAGMA dans la tradition philosophique grecque', in P. Aubenque (ed.), *Concepts et catégories dans la pensée antique* (1980), 309-19.

Hall, Stuart George (ed.), *Gregory of Nyssa, Homilies on Ecclesiastes: an English Version with Supporting Studies: Proceedings of the Seventh International Colloquium on Gregory of Nyssa (St. Andrews, 5-10 September 1990)* (Berlin, 1993).

Harl, Marguerite, 'Le guetteur et la cible: les deux sens de *skopos* dans la langue religieuse des chrétiens', *Revue des études grecques* 74 (1961), 450-68.

Harreither, Reinhardt, 'Die Synoden von Ephesos', *Mitteilungen zur christlichen Archäologie* 8 (2002), 78-94.

Hatlie, Peter, *The Monks and Monasteries of Constantinople, ca. 350-850* (Cambridge, 2007).

Henry, René (ed.), *Photius. Bibliothèque I (Codices 1-84)*, Collection byzantine (Paris, 1959).

—, *Photius. Bibliothèque IV (Codices 223-229)*, Collection byzantine (Paris, 1965).

—, *Photius. Bibliothèque V (Codices 230-241)*, Collection byzantine (Paris, 1967).

Herrin, Judith, *Byzantium: the Surprising Life of a Medieval Empire* (Princeton, 2008).

Hess, Hamilton, *The Early Development of Canon Law and the Council of Serdica*, Oxford early Christian studies (Oxford, 2002).

Hilberg, Isidor (ed.), *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae*, Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum 55, 2nd ed. (Wien, 1996).

Hofer, Josef, Karl Rahner *et al.* (eds), 'Teufel bis Zypern', *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche: begründet von Dr. Michael Buchberger* 10, 2nd ed. (Freiburg i. Breisgau, 1965).

Holl, Karl (ed.), *Epiphanius, Bände 1-3: Ancoratus und Panarion*, Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller 25, 31 and 37 (Leipzig, 1985).

Holstenius, Lucas, *Theodoti Ancyrani Expositio in Symbolum Nicaenum prodit nunc primum ex bibliotheca Barberina* (Rome, 1669).

Holum, Kenneth G., *Theodosian Empresses: Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity*, The transformation of the classical heritage 3 (Berkeley, 1982).

Honigmann, Ernest, 'Juvenal of Jerusalem' *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 5 (1950), 209-79.

—, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie anteriéure au VIe siècle*, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 127. Subsidia 2 (Louvain, 1951).

Horn, Cornelia B., *Asceticism and Christological Controversy in Fifth-century Palestine: the Career of Peter the Iberian*, Oxford early Christian studies (Oxford, 2006).

Horn, Cornelia B. and Robert Phenix (eds), *John Rufus: the Lives of Peter the Iberian, Theodosius of Jerusalem, and the Monk Romanus*, Writings from the Greco-Roman world 24 (Leiden, Boston, 2008).

Hübner, Reinhard M., *Die Schrift des Apolinarius von Laodicea gegen Photin (Pseudo-Athanasius, Contra Sabellianos) und Basilius von Caesarea*, Patristische Texte und Studien 30 (Berlin, 1989).

Humfress, Caroline, *Orthodoxy and the Courts in Late Antiquity* (Oxford, 2007).

Jaeger, Werner Wilhelm *et al.* (eds), *Gregorii Nysseni opera* (Leiden, 1952ff).

Jansen, Till, *Theodor von Mopsuestia, De Incarnatione: Überlieferung und Christologie der Griechischen und Lateinischen Fragmente einschliesslich Textausgabe* (Berlin, 2009).

Jeffreys, Elizabeth (ed.), *Rhetoric in Byzantium: Papers from the Thirty-fifth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Exeter College, University of Oxford, March 2001*, Society for the promotion of Byzantine studies. Publications 11 (Aldershot, 2003).

Joannou, Périclès Pierre (ed.), *Discipline générale antique*, Pontificia commissione per la redazione del codice di diritto canonico orientale. Fonti. [ser.1]; fasc. 9 (Grottaferrata, 1962-64).

Johnson, Lawrence J., *Worship in the Early Church: an Anthology of Historical Sources* (Collegeville, Minn., 2009).

Jouassard, Georges, 'Marie à travers la patristique: maternité divine, virginité, sainteté', in H.D. Manoir (ed.), *Maria* (1949), 19-157.

—, 'Le cas de Nestorius', *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 74 (1979), 346-8.

Judic, Bruno, Floribert Rommel and Charles Morel (eds), *Grégoire le Grand. Règle pastorale*, Sources chrétiennes 381-382 (Paris, 1992).

Juergens, Heiko, Wiebke Schaub and Martin Skutella (eds), *S. Aurelii Augustini Confessionum libri XIII*, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana 1106, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart, 1981).

Jugie, Martin (ed.), *Homélies mariales byzantines*, Patrologia Orientalis 93 (19.3) (Paris, 1926).

Kannengiesser, Charles, 'Review of *Nestorio e il concilio de Efeso. Storia, dogma, critica*. By Luigi I. Scipioni', *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, 73 (1978), 669-71.

Karwiese, Stefan, *Die Marienkirche in Ephesos. Erster vorläufiger Grabungsbericht 1984-1986*, Denkschriften, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 200 (Wien, 1989).

Kaser, Max, *Das römische Privatrecht*, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft. Abt. 10. Rechtsgeschichte des Altertums T. 3, Bd. 3 (München, 1959).

Kazhdan, Aleksandr Petrovich and Giles Constable, *People and Power in Byzantium: an Introduction to Modern Byzantine Studies* (Washington, D.C., 1982).

Keating, Daniel, 'Christology in Cyril and Leo: unnoticed parallels and ironies', *Studia Patristica* 48 (2010), 53-8.

Keating, Daniel A., *The Appropriation of Divine Life in Cyril of Alexandria*, Oxford theological monographs (Oxford, 2004).

Kecskeméti, Judit, 'Doctrine et drame dans la prédication grecque', *Euphrosyne*, N.S. 21 (1993), 29-68.

—, 'Sévérien de Gabala: exégète et théologien antiochien méconnu', *Euphrosyne*, N.S. 24 (1996), 99-126.

—, 'Deux caractéristiques de la prédication chez les prédicateurs pseudo-chrysostomiens: la répétition et le discours fictif', *Rhetorica* 14 (1996), 15-36.

Kelly, Christopher, *Ruling the Later Roman Empire*, Revealing antiquity 15 (Cambridge, Mass., 2004).

Kelly, Christopher (ed.), *Theodosius II – Rethinking the Roman Empire in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge classical studies (Cambridge, 2013).

Kelly, Christopher, Richard Flower and Michael Stuart Williams (eds), *Unclassical Traditions. Volume II: Perspectives from East and West in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, 2011).

Kennedy, George Alexander, *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*, Princeton paperbacks (Princeton, N.J., 1994).

Kinzig, Wolfram, 'The idea of progress in the early church until the age of Constantine', *Studia Patristica* 24 (1993), 119-34.

—, *Psalmenhomilien*, Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur 56 and 57 (Stuttgart, 2002).

Kinzig, Wolfram and Cornelia Kück (eds), *Judentum und Christentum zwischen Konfrontation und Faszination: Ansätze zu einer neuen Beschreibung der jüdisch-christlichen Beziehungen*, Judentum und Christentum 11 (Stuttgart, 2002).

Kinzig, Wolfram, Christoph Markschies and Markus Vinzent, *Tauffragen und Bekenntnis: Studien zur sogenannten „Traditio Apostolica" zu den „Interrogationes de fide" und zum „Römischen Glaubensbekenntnis"*, Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 74 (Berlin, 1999).

Kofsky, Arieh, *Eusebius of Caesarea Against Paganism*, Jewish and Christian perspectives series 3 (Leiden, Boston, 2000).

Kraatz, Wilhelm, *Koptische Akten zum Ephesinischen Konzil vom Jahre 431*, Texte und Untersuchungen 26 (Neue Folge, 11. Band), Heft 2 (Leipzig, 1904).

Krausmüller, Dirk, 'Theotokos-diadochos', in A. Louth and A. Casiday (eds), *Byzantine Orthodoxies* (2006), 35-54.

Kruse, Heinz, '"Gemeinschaft der Heiligen". Herkunft und Bedeutung des Glaubensartikels', *Vigiliae Christianae* 47 (1993), 246-59.

Ladstätter, Sabine and Andreas Pülz, 'Ephesus in the Late Roman and Early Byzantine period: Changes in its urban character from the third to the seventh century AD', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 141 (2007), 391-433.

Laird, Martin S., *Gregory of Nyssa and the Grasp of Faith: Union, Knowledge, and Divine Presence*, Oxford early Christian studies (Oxford; New York, 2004).

Lampe, Geoffrey William Hugo, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford, 1961.

Langslow, David R. 'The Epistula in Ancient Scientific and Technical Literature, with Special Reference to Medicine', in R. Morello and A.D. Morrison (eds), *Ancient Letters* (2007), 211-34.

Lardet, Pierre (ed.), *Saint Jérôme. Apologie contre Rufin*, Sources chrétiennes 303 (Paris, 1983).

Lavan, Luke, 'What killed the ancient city? Chronology, causation, and traces of continuity', *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 22 (2009), 803-12.

Lebon, Joseph, *Severi Antiocheni Liber contra impium grammaticum*, Corpus scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 93-4, 101-2, 111-2 (Paris, 1929, 1933, 1938).

—, *Severi Antiocheni Orationes ad Nephalium: eiusdem ac Sergii Grammatici epistulae mutuae*, Corpus scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 119-120 (Louvain, 1949).

Leemans, Johan, Peter Van Nuffelen, Shawn W. J. Keough and Carla Nicolaye (eds), *Episcopal Elections in Late Antiquity*, Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 119 (Boston, 2011).

Levy, Kenneth and Peter Jeffery (eds), *The Study of Medieval Chant: Paths and Bridges, East and West: in Honor of Kenneth Levy* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2001).

L'Huillier, Pierre, *The Church of the Ancient Councils: the Disciplinary Work of the First Four Ecumenical Councils* (New York, 1996).

Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott and Henry Stuart Jones (eds), *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed. (Oxford, 1996).

Lim, Richard, 'Religious disputation and social disorder in late antiquity', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 44 (1995), 204-31.

Limberis, Vasiliki, *Divine Heiress: the Virgin Mary and the Creation of Christian Constantinople* (London, 1994).

Loofs, Friedrich, *Leontius von Byzanz und die gleichnamigen Schriftsteller der griechischen Kirche*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 3, Hft. 1-2 (Leipzig, 1887).

—, *Nestoriana: die Fragmente des Nestorius* (Halle a. S., 1905).

—, *Nestorius and his Place in the History of Christian Doctrine* (Cambridge, 1914).

Loon, Hans van, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 96 (Leiden, 2009).

Louth, Andrew and Augustine Casiday (eds), *Byzantine Orthodoxies: Papers from the Thirty-sixth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Durham, 23-25 March 2002*, Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies 12 (Aldershot, 2006).

Ludlow, Morwenna, 'Demons, Evil, and Liminality in Cappadocian Theology', *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 29 (2012), 179-211.

Ludolf, Hiob, *Jobi Ludolfi I.C. Lexicon aethiopico-latinum: ex omnibus libris impressis, nonnullisque manuscriptis collectum, et cum docto quodam aethiope relectum; accessit authoris Grammatica, cum aliis nonnullis, quorum catalogum sequens pagina exhibebit; nunc primum in lucem editum, studio & cura Johannis Michaelis Wanslebii* (London, 1661).

Lupus, Chretien and Tommaso Antonio Filippini, *Ad Ephesinum Concilium Variorum Patrum Epistolae: ex manuscripto Cassinensis Bibliothecae Codice desumptae: item ex Vaticanae Bibliothecae manuscripto ... nunc primum in publicam lucem data* (Venice, 1726).

Lyman, Rebecca, 'A topography of heresy: mapping the rhetorical creation of arianism', in M.R. Barnes and D.H. Williams, (eds), *Arianism after Arius* (1993), 45-62.

MacMullen, Ramsay, 'The preacher's audience (ad 350-400)', *Journal of Theological Studies* 40 (1989), 503-11.

—, *Voting about God in Early Church Councils* (New Haven, 2006).

Macrides, Ruth (ed.), *Travel in the Byzantine World: Papers from the Thirty-fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Birmingham, April 2000*, Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies publications 10 (Aldershot, 2002).

Manoir, Hubert Du (ed.), *Maria: études sur la Sainte Vierge. Tome 1* (Paris, 1949).

Mansi, Giovan Domenico, *Ab anno CCCCXXXI. ad annum CCCCXLI.*, Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio 5 (Florence, 1761).

—, *Ab anno 787 usque ad anno 814*, Sacrorum conciliorum: nova et amplissima collectio 13 (Florence, 1767).

Marrou, Henri Irénée, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*, 2nd rev. et augm. ed. (Paris, 1948).

—, *A History of Education in Antiquity* (New York, 1956).

Martens, Pieter William (ed.), *In the Shadow of the Incarnation: Essays on Jesus Christ in the Early Church in Honor of Brian E. Daley, S.J.* (Notre Dame, Ind., 2008).

Mateo-Seco, Lucas F., 'Der Titel "Gottesmutter" in der Theologie der Kirchenväter vor dem Konzil von Ephesus', *Sedes Sapientiae: Mariologisches Jahrbuch* 8 (2004), 5-36.

Maxwell, Jaclyn LaRae, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity: John Chrysostom and his Congregation in Antioch* (Cambridge, 2006).

—, 'Education, humility and choosing ideal bishops in late antiquity', in J. Leemans *et al.* (eds), *Episcopal Elections* (2011), 449-62.

Mayer, Wendy, 'John Chrysostom: extraordinary preacher, ordinary audience', in M. Cunningham and P. Allen, (eds), *Preacher and Audience* (1998), 105-37.
McGuckin, John Anthony, *St. Gregory of Nazianzus: an Intellectual Biography* (Crestwood, N.Y., 2001).
—, *St. Cyril of Alexandria: the Christological Controversy: its History, Theology, and Texts* (Crestwood, N.Y., 2004).
—, 'Mystery or conundrum? The apprehension of Christ in the Chalcedonian definition', in P.W. Martens (ed.), *In the Shadow of the Incarnation* (2008), 246-59.
McKenzie, Judith, *The Architecture of Alexandria and Egypt, c. 300 B.C. to A.D. 700*, Pelican history of art (New Haven, Conn., 2007).
McLynn, Neil B., *Christian Politics and Religious Culture in Late Antiquity* (Farnham, 2009).
Meissner, Henriette M., 'Grammatik und Rhetorik in Gregors von Nyssa Exegese des Buches Prediger: Beobachtungen zur fünften Homilie', in S.G. Hall (ed.), *Gregory of Nyssa, Homilies on Ecclesiastes* (1992), 223-76.
Mendels, Doron, 'The relationship of Christians and Jews during the years 300-450: A preliminary report of the Christian point of view', in W. Kinzig and C. Kück (eds), *Judentum und Christentum* (2002), 45-54.
Merkt, Andreas, 'Mündlichkeit: Ein Problem der Hermeneutik patristischer Predigten', *Studia Patristica* 31 (1997), 76-85.
Metzger, Marcel (ed.), *Les constitutions apostoliques*, Sources chrétiennes 336 (Paris, 1987).
Metzler, Karin, Martin Tetz and Kyriakos Savvidis (eds), *Oratio III contra Arianos*. Athanasius Werke 1. Die dogmatische Schriften 3 (Berlin, 2000).
Meunier, Bernard, *Le Christ de Cyrille d'Alexandrie: l'humanité, le salut et la question monophysite*, Théologie historique 104 (Paris, 1997).
Meyendorff, John, 'Continuities and Discontinuities in Byzantine Religious Thought', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 47 (1993), 69-81.
Migne, Jacques Paul (ed.), *Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Latina* (Paris, 1844-1855).
—, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graeca* (Paris, 1857-1866).
—, *S. Cyrillus Alexandrinus, Theodotus Ancyranus, Paulus Emesenus, Joannes Antiochenus, Acacius Berrhœensis, Memno Ephesinus, Acacius Melitensis, Rabbulas Edessenus, Amphilochius Sidenus*, Patrologiæ cursus completus: seu, Bibliotheca universalis, integra, uniformis, commoda, oeconomica omnium SS. patrum, doctorum, scriptorumque ecclesiasticorum. Series græca 77 (Paris, 1859).
Millar, Fergus, *A Greek Roman Empire: Power and Belief under Theodosius II (408/450)*, Sather Classical Lectures 64 (Berkeley, 2006).
Miller, Emmanuel, *Catalogue des manuscrits grecs de la bibliothèque de l'Escurial* (Amsterdam, 1848).
Miller, Patricia Cox, *Women in Early Christianity: Translations from Greek Texts* (Washington, DC., 2005).
Mitchell, Stephen, 'The life of saint Theodotus of Ancyra', *Anatolian Studies* 32 (1982), 93-113.
—, *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor* (Oxford, 1995).
—, *A History of the Later Roman Empire, AD 284-641: the Transformation of the Ancient World*, Blackwell history of the ancient world (Oxford, 2007).

Mommsen, Theodor and Paul Martin Meyer (eds), *Theodosiani libri XVI cum Constitutionibus Sirmondianis; et leges novellae ad Theodosianum pertinentes*, Les lois religieuses des empereurs romains de Constantin à Théodose II (312-438) (Berlin, 1905).

Monaco, Giusto (ed.), *Studi di filologia classica in onore di Giusto Monaco* (Palermo, 1991).

Morello, Ruth and Andrew D. Morrison (eds), *Ancient Letters: Classical and Late Antique Epistolography* (Oxford, 2007).

Moreschini, Claudio and Gallay, Paul (eds), *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 38-41*, Sources chrétiennes 358 (Paris, 1990).

Morris, Rosemary (ed.), *Church and People in Byzantium: Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies: Twentieth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Manchester, 1986* (Birmingham, 1990).

Mosheim, Johann Lorenz and James Murdock, 'Primitive period', *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History: Ancient and Modern* 1 (New Haven, 1832).

Müller, Caspar and Gustav Detlef, 'Alexandrien', in *Agende-Anselm von Canterbury*, Theologische Realenzyklopädie 2 (Berlin, 1978), 248-64.

Mueller, Fridericus, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera* (Leiden, 1958).

Mullett, M. E., 'In peril on the sea: travel genres and the unexpected', in R. Macrides (ed.), *Travel in the Byzantine World* (2002), 259-84.

Nacke, Ewald, *Das Zeugnis der Väter in der Theologischen Beweisführung Cyrills von Alexandrien nach seinen Briefen und antinestorianischen Schriften*, PhD thesis, Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität Münster. Katholisch-Theologische Fakultät (Münster, 1964).

Nau, François, *Le Livre d'Héraclide de Damas* (Paris, 1910).

Neil, Bronwen, Pauline Allen and Wendy Mayer (eds), *Preaching Poverty in Late Antiquity: Perceptions and Realities*, Arbeiten zur Kirchen- und Theologiegeschichte 28 (Leipzig, 2009).

Neuschäfer, Bernhard, *Origenes als Philologe*, Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 18 (Basel, 1987).

Nicholson, John, 'The delivery and confidentiality of Cicero's letters', *Classical Journal* 90 (1994), 33-63.

Norton, Peter, *Episcopal Elections 250-600: Hierarchy and Popular Will in Late Antiquity*, Oxford classical monographs (Oxford, 2007).

Nuffelen, Peter Van, 'The rhetoric of rules and the rule of consensus', in J. Leemans *et al.* (eds), *Episcopal Elections* (2011), 243-58.

O'Keefe, John J., '"A letter that killeth": toward a reassessment of Antiochene exegesis, or Diodore, Theodore, and Theodoret on the Psalms', *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 8 (2000), 83-103.

—, 'Incorruption, anti-Origenism, and Incarnation: Eschatology in the thought of Cyril of Alexandria', in T.G. Weinandy and D.A. Keating (eds), *The Theology of St. Cyril* (2003), 187-204.

Olivar, Alexandre, *La predicación cristiana antigua*, Biblioteca Herder 189 (Barcelona, 1991).

Opitz, Hans-Georg (ed.), *Athanasius Werke. Band II, Lieferung 1* (Berlin, 1935).

Parmentier, Léon and Felix Scheidweiler (eds), *Theodoret. Kirchengeschichte*, Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der erstèn Jahrhunderte 44 (19), 2nd ed. (Berlin, 1954).

Parvis, Sara, *Marcellus of Ancyra and the Lost Years of the Arian Controversy, 325-345*, Oxford early Christian studies (Oxford, 2006).

Pauly, August Friedrich von and Georg Wissowa, *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft: neue Bearbeitung*, 2. Reihe 2 (Stuttgart, 1934).

Payne, Richard E., 'Persecuting heresy in early Islamic Iraq: the Catholicos Ishoyahb III and the elites of Nisibis', in A. Cain and N.E. Lenski (eds), *The Power of Religion in Late Antiquity* (2009), 397-409.

Peltomaa, Leena Mari, *The Image of the Virgin Mary in the Akathistos Hymn*, The Medieval Mediterranean 35 (Leiden, 2001).

Périchon, Pierre and Pierre Maraval (eds), *Socrate de Constantinople. Histoire ecclésiastique*, Sources chrétiennes 477, 493, 505, 506 (Paris, 2004-7).

Pernot, Laurent, *La rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde gréco-romain*, Collection des études augustiniennes. Série Antiquité 137-8 (Paris, 1993).

Petschenig, Michael (ed.), *Iohannis Cassiani De institutis coenobiorum et de octo principalium vitiorum remediis libri XII; De incarnatione Domini contra Nestorium libri VII*, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 17.1 (Vienna, 1888).

Pietri, Charles, Luce Pietri and J. Biarne (eds), *Naissance d'une chrétienté (250-430)*, Histoire du christianisme des origines à nos jours 2 (Paris, 1995).

Pin, Louis Ellies Du and William Wotton, *Containing the Authors that Flourished in the Latter Part of the Fifth Century*, A new History of Ecclesiastical Writers: containing an account of the authors of the several Books of the Old and New Testament; of the Lives and Writings of the Primitive Fathers; an abridgment and catalogue of their works; their various editions, and censures determining the genuine and spurious. Together with a judgment upon their style and doctrine. Also, a compendious History of the Councils; with chronological tables of the whole 4 (London, 1693).

Pitra, Jean-Baptiste, *Spicilegium solesmense complectens sanctorum patrum scriptorumque ecclesiasticorum anecdota hactenus opera: selecta e graecis orientalibusque et latinis codicibus* (Paris, 1852).

Porter, Stanley E. (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.-A.D. 400* (Leiden, 1997).

Price, Richard, 'Marian piety and the Nestorian controversy', in R.N. Swanson (ed.), *The Church and Mary* (2004), 31-8.

—, 'Presidency and Procedure at the Early Ecumenical Councils', *Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum*, 41 (2009), 241-74.

Price, Richard and Michael Gaddis, *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, Translated texts for historians 45 (Liverpool, 2005).

Price, Richard and Mary Whitby (eds), *Chalcedon in Context: Church Councils 400-700*, Translated texts for historians. Contexts 1 (Liverpool, 2009).

Pruche, Benoît (ed.), *Basile de Césarée. Sur le Saint-Esprit*, Sources chrétiennes 17 bis, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1968).

Pusey, Philip Edward (ed.), *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis Evangelium* (Oxford, 1872).

—, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini Epistolae tres oecumenicae; Libri quinque contra Nestorium; XII capitum explanatio; XII capitum defensio utraque: Scholia de incarnatione unigeniti* (Oxford, 1875).

Quasten, Johannes, *The Golden Age of Greek Patristic Literature, from the Council of Nicaea to the Council of Chalcedon*, Patrology 3 (Utrecht, 1960).

Rapp, Claudia, 'The elite status of bishops in late antiquity in ecclesiastical, spiritual, and social contexts', *Arethusa* 33 (2000), 379-99.

—, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity. The Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition* (Berkeley, 2005).

Rebenich, Stefan, 'Freund und Feind bei Augustin und in der christlichen Spätantike', in T. Fuhrer (ed.), *Die christlich-philosophischen Diskurse der Spätantike* (2008), 11-31.

Redies, Michael, 'Kyrill und Nestorius: Eine Neuinterpretation des Theotokos-Streits', *Klio. Beiträge zur alten Geschichte* 80 (1998), 195-208.

Rich, Antony D., *Discernment in the Desert Fathers: Diákrisis in the Life and Thought of Early Egyptian Monasticism*, Studies in Christian history and thought (Milton Keynes, 2007).

Richter, Gerhard, *Oikonomia: der Gebrauch des Wortes Oikonomia im Neuen Testament, bei den Kirchenvätern und in der theologischen Literatur bis ins 20. Jahrhundert*, Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 90 (Berlin, 2005).

Robert, Louis, 'Malédictions funéraires grecques', *Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 122 (1978), 241-89.

Roberts, Colin H. (ed.), *Theological and Literary Texts (no. 457-551)*, Catalogue of the Greek papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester 3 (Manchester, 1938).

Rohrbacher, David, *The Historians of Late Antiquity* (London, 2002).

Ronning, Christian, 'Rituale der Rhetorik – Rhetorik der Rituale. Überlegungen zu Konstantin als Identifikationsfigur in der spätantiken Panegyrik', in B. Aland *et al.* (eds), *Literarische Konstituierung von Identifikationsfiguren* (2003), 111-37.

Ross, William David (ed.), *Aristotle. Ars rhetorica*, Scriptorum classicorum bibliotheca Oxoniensis (Oxford, 1959).

Rucker, Ignaz, 'Ephesinische Konzilsakten in armenischgeorgischer Überlieferung', *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Abteilung* 1930 (1930).

Russell, Norman, *Cyril of Alexandria* (London, 2000).

—, *The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition*, Oxford early Christian studies (Oxford, 2004).

Schäublin, Christoph, *Untersuchungen zu Methode und Herkunft der antiochenischen Exegese*, Theophaneia, Beiträge zur Religions- und Kirchengeschichte des Altertums 23 (Köln, 1974).

Schor, Adam M., *Theodoret's People: Social Networks and Religious Conflict in Late Roman Syria*, Transformation of the classical heritage 48 (Berkeley, 2011).

Schulze, Johann Ludwig, *[Tou Makariou Theodoretou Episkopou Kurou apanta] = B. Theodoreti Episcopi Cyri Opera omnia: ex recensione Iacobi Sirmondi* 5 (Halle, 1774).

Schwartz, Eduard, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum – iussu atque mandato Societatis Scientiarum Argentoratensis edidit Eduardus Schwartz [continuauit Johannes Straub]* (Berlin, 1914ff.).

—, 'Cassian und Nestorius', in *Konzilstudien*, Schriften der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft in Strassburg 20 (Strassburg, 1914), 1-70.

—, 'Cyrill und der Mönch Viktor', *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, philosophisch-historische Klasse* 208(4) (1926), 1-51.

—, *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431: eine antichalkedonische Sammlung aus der Zeit Kaiser Zenos*, Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Philologische und Historische Klasse XXXII, 6. Abh (München, 1927).

—, *Zwei Predigten Hippolyts*. Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philosophisch-Historische Abteilung 3 (München, 1936).

Schwartz, Eduard and Theodor Mommsen (eds), *Eusebius Caesariensis Werke. Band 2, Teil 1-2: Die Kirchengeschichte*, Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte 9 (Leipzig, 1903, 1908).

Scipioni, Luigi I., *Nestorio e il concilio de Efeso: Storia, dogma, critica*, Pubblicazioni della Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore. Studia Patristica Mediolanensia 1 (Milano, 1974).

Sciuto, Francesco Erasmo, *Un episodio sconosciuto della controversia cristologica durante il Concilio d'Efeso: Euterio di Tiana contro Teodoto d'Ancira* (Catania, 1984).

—, 'Una citazione virgiliana in Teodoto di Ancyra (V sec)', in G. Monaco (ed.), *Studi di filologia classica* (1991), 517-26.

Seeliger, Hans Reinhard, 'Die Erforschung der spätantiken Bischofssitze des syrisch-palästinischen Raumes und ihrer Bauten', in D. Bumazhnov *et al.* (eds), *Syrien im 1.-7. Jahrhundert* (2011), 195-210.

Shchuryk, Oleh, 'The Christological Position of Acacius of Melitene in the Context of the Council of Ephesus 431', *Studia Patristica* 45 (2010), 131-8.

Shoemaker, Stephen J., *Ancient Traditions of the Virgin Mary's Dormition and Assumption*, Oxford early Christian studies (Oxford, 2006).

—, 'Between scripture and tradition: the Marian apocrypha of early Christianity', in L. DiTommaso and L. Turcescu (eds), *The Reception and Interpretation of the Bible in Late Antiquity* (2008), 491-510.

Shults, F. LeRon, 'A Dubious Christological Formula: From Leontius of Byzantium to Karl Barth' *Theological Studies* 57 (1996), 431-46.

Sieben, Hermann-Joseph, 'Zur Entwicklung der Konzilsidee', *Theologie und Philosophie (VI): Vom „Konzil der 318 Väter" zu den „katholischen Konzilien" der Kirche* 48 (1973), 28-64.

Siegert, Folker, 'Homily and panegyrical sermon', in S.E. Porter (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric* (1997), 421-43.

Simonetti, Manlio, 'Alcune osservazioni sul monofisismo di Cirillo di Alessandria', *Augustinianum*, 22 (1982), 493-511.

Sode, Claudia and Sarolta Takács (eds), *Novum Millennium: Studies on Byzantine History and Culture Dedicated to Paul Speck* (Aldershot, 2001).

Söll, Georg, *Mariologie*, Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte III, 4 (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1978).

Spade, Paul Vincent, *Five Texts on the Mediaeval Problem of Universals: Porphyry, Boethius, Abelard, Duns Scotus, Ockham* (Indianapolis, Cambridge, 1994).

Spira, Andreas and Hubertus R. Drobner, *Kleine Schriften zu Antike und Christentum: Menschenbild - Rhetorik - Gregor von Nyssa*, Patrologia: Beiträge zum Studium der Kirchenväter 17 (Frankfurt am Main, 2007).

Srawley, James Herbert, *The Catechetical Oration of Gregory of Nyssa*, Cambridge patristic texts (Cambridge, 1903).

Sterk, Andrea, *Renouncing the World yet Leading the Church: the Monk-bishop in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, MA; London, 2004).

Stewart, Columba, *Cassian the Monk*, Oxford studies in historical theology (New York, Oxford, 1999).

Stewart-Sykes, Alistair, *From Prophecy to Preaching: a Search for the Origins of the Christian Homily*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 59 (Leiden, 2001).

Stickelberger, Hans, 'Substanz und Akzidens bei Leontinus von Byzanz. Die Veränderung eines philosophischen Denkmodells durch die Cristologie', *Theologische Zeitschrift* 36 (1980), 153-61.

Straw, Carole Ellen and Richard Lim (eds), *The Past Before Us: the Challenge of Historiographies of Late Antiquity*, Bibliothèque de l'Antiquité tardive 6 (Turnhout, 2004).

Swanson, Robert Norman (ed.), *The Church and Mary*, Studies in Church History 39 (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2004).

Talbert, Richard J.A., *The Senate of Imperial Rome* (Princeton, N.J., 1984).

Tetz, Martin, *Eine Antilogie des Eutherios con Tyana*, Patristische Texte und Studien 1 (Berlin, 1964).

Treadgold, Warren T., *The Early Byzantine Historians* (Basingstoke, 2007).

Tzamalikos, Panagiōtēs, *The Real Cassian Revisited: Monastic Life, Greek Paideia, and Origenism in the Sixth Century*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 112 (Leiden, 2012).

Uthemann, Karl-Heinz, 'Die Sprachtheorie des Eunomios von Kyzikos und Severianos von Gabala. Theologie im Reflex kirchlicher Predigt', *Studia Patristica* 24 (1993), 336-44.

—, 'Forms of communication in the homilies of Severian of Gabala: a contribution to the reception of the diatribe as a method of exposition', in M. Cunningham and P. Allen (eds), *Preacher and Audience* (1998), 139-77.

—, *Christus, Kosmos, Diatribe: Themen der frühen Kirche als Beiträge zu einer historischen Theologie*, Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 93 (Berlin, 2005).

Vacant, Alfred, Eugène Mangenot and Emile Amann, *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique: contenant l'exposé des doctrines de la théologie catholique, leurs preuves et leur histoire* (Paris, 1915-1950).

Valensi, Lucette, *La fuite en Égypte: histoires d'Orient et d'Occident; essai d'histoire comparée* (Paris, 2002).

van Roey, Albert, 'Le florilège nestorien dans le «Traité contre Nestorius» de Théodote d'Ancyre', *Studia Patristica* XII (TU 115) (1975), 155-9.

—, 'Le florilège nestorien de l'Adversus Nestorium de Cyrille d'Alexandrie et du traité contre Nestorius de Théodote d'Ancyre', *TU* 125 (1981), 573-8.

Vannier, Marie-Anne, 'Le *De incarnatione Domini* de Jean Cassien', in Bădiliță, Cristian and Attila Jakab (eds), *Jean Cassien entre l'Orient et l'Occident. Actes du colloque international organisé par le New Europe College en collaboration avec la Ludwig Boltzmann Gesellschaft (Bucarest, 27-28 septembre 2001)* (Paris, 2003), 49-63.

Vannier, Marie-Anne (ed.), *Pères et la naissance de l'ecclésiologie*, Patrimoines Christianisme (Paris, 2009).

Viller, Marcel, Ferdinand Cavallera and Joseph de Guibert, *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique: doctrine et histoire* (Paris, 1932ff).

Vinzent, Markus, *Pseudo-Athanasius, Contra Arianos IV: eine Schrift gegen Asterius von Kappadokien, Eusebius von Cäsarea, Markell von Ankyra und Photin von Sirmium*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 36 (Leiden, 1996).

—, 'Vom philosophischen Apologeten zum theologischen Ketzerbekämpfer. Zur biographischen Verkirchlichung von christlichen Amtsträgern am Beispiel Kyrills von Alexandrien', in B. Aland *et al.* (eds), *Literarische Konstituierung von Identifikationsfiguren* (2003), 173-94.

Voicu, Sever J., 'Note su un'omelia pseudocrisostomica per il natale (CPG 5068; BHG 1920q)', *Orpheus* 13 (1992), 354-363.

Watts, Edward Jay, *City and School in Late Antique Athens and Alexandria* (Berkeley, Calif.; London, 2006).

Webb, Ruth, 'Praise and persuasion: argumentation and audience response in epideictic oratory', in E. Jeffreys, (ed.), *Rhetoric in Byzantium* (2003), 127-35.

Weckwerth, Andreas, *Ablauf, Organisation und Selbstverständnis westlicher antiker Synoden im Spiegel ihrer Akten*, PhD thesis, Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, Philosophischen Fakultät (Bonn, 2007).

—, *Ablauf, Organisation und Selbstverständnis westlicher antiker Synoden im Spiegel ihrer Akten*, Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum. Ergänzungsband, Kleine Reihe 5 (Münster, 2010).

Weischer, Bernd Manuel, *Der Dialog 'Dass Christus einer ist' des Kyrillos von Alexandrien*, Qērellos 3 (Wiesbaden, 1977).

—, *Homilien und Briefe zum Konzil von Ephesos*, Qērellos 4.1 (Wiesbaden, 1979).

—, *Traktate des Epiphanios von Zypern und des Proklos von Kyzikos*, Qērellos 4.2 (Wiesbaden, 1979).

—, *Traktate des Severianos von Gabala, Gregorios Thaumaturgos und Kyrillos von Alexandrien*, Qērellos 4.3 (Wiesbaden, 1980).

Weinandy, Thomas G. and Daniel A. Keating (eds), *The Theology of St. Cyril of Alexandria: a Critical Appreciation* (London, 2003).

Wessel, Susan, 'Nestorius, Mary and Controversy, in Cyril of Alexandria's Homily IV. (*De Maria deipara in Nestorium*, CPG 5248)', *Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum* 31 (1999), 1-49.

—, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy: the Making of a Saint and of a Heretic*, The Oxford early Christian studies (Oxford, 2004).

Westra, Liuwe H., *The Apostles' Creed: Origin, History and some early Commentaries*, Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia. Research on the inheritance of early and medieval Christianity 43 (Turnhout, 2002).

Whitby, Mary (ed.), *The Propaganda of Power: the Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum 183 (Leiden, 1998).

Wickham, Lionel R., 'Homily 4', in S.G. Hall (ed.), *Gregory of Nyssa, Homilies on Ecclesiastes* (1992), 177-184.

—, 'Review of *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*. By Hans van Loon', *The Journal of Theological Studies* 61 (2010), 381-3.

Williams, Daniel Harrison, 'Monarchianism and Photinus of Sirmium as the persistent heretical face of the fourth century', *Harvard Theological Review* 99 (2006), 187-206.

Willing, Meike, *Eusebius von Cäsarea als Häreseograph*, Patristische Texte und Studien 63 (Berlin, 2008).

Winkelmann, Friedhelm (ed.), *Eusebius Werke: 1. Band, 1. Teil, Über das Leben des Kaisers Konstantin*, Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte (Berlin, 1975).

Wipszycka, Ewa, *Études sur le christianisme dans l'Égypte de l'antiquité tardive*, Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 52 (Roma, 1996).

Wright, William, *Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum Acquired since the Year 1838* (New Jersey, 2002).

Young, Frances Margaret, 'A reconsideration of Alexandrian Christology', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 22 (1971), 103-14.

—, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge, 1997).

—, 'God's image: the 'elephant in the room' in the 4th century?', *Studia Patristica* 50 (2011), 57-71.

Zuurmond, Rochus, *Novum testamentum Aethiopice: the synoptic gospels; Part III: The Gospel of Matthew*, Äthiopistische Forschungen 55 (Wiesbaden, 2001).

Index locorum

Abelard, *Logica ingredientibus* 190
Aristotle, *Ars Rhetorica*
I, 2 1356a1-13 103
I, 11 1371a8-17 103
Athanasius
Epistula ad Epictetum 160
Oratio tertia adversus Arianos 3, 5 166
Augustine, *Confessionum libri XIII* IV 64
Basil of Caesarea
Homilia 14, 1 62
Liber de Spiritu sancto 18 166
Canons
Apostolical Canon 74 54
Constantinople, Canon 2 54
Nicaea, Canon 6 47
Serdica, Canon 10 22
Chrysippus of Jerusalem, *In sanctam Mariam* 117
Codex Theodosianus
I 1, 5-6 19
XVI 1, 2 23
Concilium Chalcedonensis
22 Post Concilium Constitutio 190
23 Edictum 190
Actio I 282-6 24
Actio VII 4 23, 30
Actio XVII 18 2, 17
Actio XVII 35 17, 67
Epistularum collectio M 11 186
Concilium Constantinopolitanum II
Actio V 91
Concilium Ephesinum
Collectio Atheniensis
Coll. Ath. 24 169-70
Coll. Ath. 45 81, 83
Coll. Ath. 55 19
Coll. Ath. 56 19
Coll. Ath. 59 83
Coll. Ath. 62 83, 86
Coll. Ath. 63 76
Coll. Ath. 65 83, 86
Coll. Ath. 66 83-4
Coll. Ath. 71 48
Coll. Ath. 72 48
Coll. Ath. 76 22, 114
Coll. Ath. 77 25
Coll. Ath. 81 81
Coll. Ath. 97 83, 85-6
Coll. Ath. 107 54
Coll. Ath. 116 87
Coll. Ath. 118 65
Collectio Casinensis
Coll. Cas. 81 49
Coll. Cas. 82 43, 53
Coll. Cas. 83 48-9
Coll. Cas. 84 49, 53
Coll. Cas. 86 53
Coll. Cas. 87 53
Coll. Cas. 95 48, 76
Coll. Cas. 111 97
Coll. Cas. 112 19, 83
Coll. Cas. 113 19
Coll. Cas. 114 84
Coll. Cas. 115 84
Coll. Cas. 116 84
Coll. Cas. 117 84
Coll. Cas. 119 84
Coll. Cas. 120 84
Coll. Cas. 127 45, 83, 85, 118
Coll. Cas. 132 66
Coll. Cas. 133 87
Coll. Cas. 134 88
Coll. Cas. 139 68
Coll. Cas. 278 87-8
Coll. Cas. 279 87
Coll. Cas. 303 88
Collectio Palatina
Coll. Pal. 22 76, 159
Collectio Vaticana
Coll. Vat. 1 43, 87, 112, 136, 158, 170, 176, 178, 185, 187
Coll. Vat. 3 66
Coll. Vat. 4 157, 176
Coll. Vat. 5 54, 66, 73, 176, 185
Coll. Vat. 6 46, 59, 131
Coll. Vat. 7 159, 169-70
Coll. Vat. 8 18
Coll. Vat. 9 73, 75

Coll. Vat. 10 38, 46, 59, 77
Coll. Vat. 11 26, 38
Coll. Vat. 14 117
Coll. Vat. 18 122, 158
Coll. Vat. 19 11, 76, 90, 117, 120
Coll. Vat. 23 136
Coll. Vat. 25 24, 43-5, 50
Coll. Vat. 28 71
Coll. Vat. 30 45
Coll. Vat. 31 49, 52, 82
Coll. Vat. 34 50
Coll. Vat. 36 50, 52
Coll. Vat. 37 49, 51
Coll. Vat. 38 45
Coll. Vat. 39 53
Coll. Vat. 40 45, 53
Coll. Vat. 41 53
Coll. Vat. 42 53, 67
Coll. Vat. 43 54
Coll. Vat. 44 29, 54-5
Coll. Vat. 45 21, 55-6, 69, 77, 117
Coll. Vat. 46 57
Coll. Vat. 47 57-9
Coll. Vat. 51 59
Coll. Vat. 52 53
Coll. Vat. 53 48, 60, 62, 69, 91
Coll. Vat. 60 60, 67, 70, 73, 96, 136, 161, 176
Coll. Vat. 61 47
Coll. Vat. 62 127
Coll. Vat. 67 46, 63, 68, 74, 78
Coll. Vat. 70 75-6, 95, 141-2, 145
Coll. Vat. 71 64, 75, 93, 95-102, 127, 129-134, 143-5, 149, 151, 154-8, 161-4, 171-2, 174-8, 180, 182, 184-7, 192-8
Coll. Vat. 72 11, 18, 20, 27, 48, 66, 71, 98, 105, 107, 109-112, 117, 154, 157-9, 161-6, 168, 171, 175, 178-184, 194
Coll. Vat. 73 21, 48, 71, 98, 103-4, 106-7, 109, 111-2, 131-2, 134, 136, 139, 145, 154-8, 160-1, 164, 166, 168, 171, 173, 175, 179-185, 188-9, 194-7
Coll. Vat. 74 71, 92, 117, 123, 155
Coll. Vat. 75 47, 95, 151
Coll. Vat. 76 93, 97-8, 176
Coll. Vat. 77 151
Coll. Vat. 79 166
Coll. Vat. 80 75, 117, 193
Coll. Vat. 81 70
Coll. Vat. 82 62, 70, 73
Coll. Vat. 83 72, 78
Coll. Vat. 84 70
Coll. Vat. 85 73, 76, 84
Coll. Vat. 87 81
Coll. Vat. 88 81
Coll. Vat. 91 127
Coll. Vat. 92 44, 67
Coll. Vat. 93 45, 81-2, 86
Coll. Vat. 94 82
Coll. Vat. 95 48
Coll. Vat. 101 76
Coll. Vat. 102 84
Coll. Vat. 106 46, 77-9
Coll. Vat. 108 83
Coll. Vat. 109 66, 83, 85-6
Coll. Vat. 110 86, 88
Coll. Vat. 111 89
Coll. Vat. 112 39, 115
Coll. Vat. 115 44, 170
Coll. Vat. 119 186
Coll. Vat. 120 65
Coll. Vat. 123 68
Coll. Vat. 127 88, 192
Coll. Vat. 128 88
Coll. Vat. 135 66
Coll. Vat. 140 70, 170
Coll. Vat. 144 112
Coll. Vat. 145 42, 117
Coll. Vat. 146 48-9
Coll. Vat. 148 177-8, 187
Coll. Vat. 149 18
Coll. Vat. 150 115
Coll. Vat. 151 45, 49-50, 70, 75-6
Coll. Vat. 152 75
Coll. Vat. 153 45, 48
Coll. Vat. 154 42, 45
Coll. Vat. 160 117
Coll. Vat. 166 87
Coll. Vat. 172 185-6
Excerpta Parisina I 137
Cyril
Commentarii in Joannem 169
De sancta trinitate 169

De trinitate dialogi 3, 466a 187
Glaphyra in Pentateuchum 166, 187
Quod unus sit Christus 3
Thesaurus de sancta consubstantiali trinitate 169
Epiphanius of Salamis
Homilia 91
Panarion 170
Symbolum 91
Eusebius of Cæsarea
De vita Constantini
3, 8-27 25
42-5 23
Epistula ad Caesarienses 24
Historia ecclesiastica
VI, 19, 16 62
VII, 30, 10 62
Eusebius of Herakleia, *Homilia* 91, 149
Evagrius, *Peri logismon* 8 190
Firmus of Cæsarea, *Homilia* 77, 131, 149
Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oratio 39*, 12 167
Gregory of Nyssa
Adversus Macedonianos de spiritu sancto 170
Homilia in Ecclesiasten 36
Homilia 2 103
Oratio catechetica magna 8 170
Gregory the Great, *Regula pastoralis* III 19, 37
Hippolytus, *Contra haeresin Noeti* 3, 5, 224 158
Jerome
Adversus Rufinum 62
Epistula 92 (*Theophilus, synodica epistula*) 140
John Cassian
De incarnatione VII, 26 69
De institutis coenobiorum V, 1 189
John of Damascus, *Sacra parallela* 108
John Rufus, *Vita Petri Iberi* 19-20 66
Juvenal, *Homilia Ephesina* 93, 141-3
Leontius of Byzantium, *Contra Nestorianus et Eutychianus* 170
Martyrii Theodotii 1, 2 32
Nestorius
Homilia IV (de incarnatione) 160
Liber Heraclides 60, 80, 163, 185
117 52
195 52
199 52, 54
I/1, 8 159
I/3, 98-9 159
Syriac hagiography 66
Nicephorus
Antirrhetica 108, 125
Historia ecclesiastica XIV, 34, 70 1
Nilus of Ancyra, *Oratio in Albianum* 32
Palladius of Aspuna, *Historia Lausiaca* 30
Photius Constantinopolitanus, *Bibliotheca*
59, 19a15-6 22
228, 248a32-4 116
231 (287a, 17-8) 1
Plato
Protagoras 314b 130
Respublica VI 509D–513E 184
Proclus, *Homilia* 4 66, 107, 119, 189, 230
Pseudo-Athanasius, *Contra Arianos IV* 105
Pseudo-Macarius, *Homiliae spirituales* 50 (collectio H), 17 166
Rheginus of Cyprus, *Sermo Ephesi habitus* 76-7, 90, 95, 122-3, 131, 141, 145, 149, 198
Severus of Antioch
Liber contra impium Grammaticum 126
Orationes ad Nephalium 126
Severus of Synada, *Homilia Ephesina* 93, 190
Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica*
I, 8 24
II, 18, 7 159
II, 29, 1-5 159
IV, 8 32
VII, 29 26
VII, 29, 4-5 23
VII, 32, 5-6 160
VII, 34, 14 1, 70
XIV, 34, 70 70
Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica*
I, 17 24
VI, 34 32
VIII, 1 33
Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Contra Eunomium* 165
Theodoret of Cyrrhus
Epistula CXII 42

Historia ecclesiastica, V 24
Theodosius II
see Codex Theodosianus
Theodotus
Adversus Nestorium 87, 89, 123
Expositio symboli Nicaeni 3, 18, 25, 86-7, 98, 114-5, 131, 173, 206
Homilia I
see Concilium Ephesinum – Coll. Vat. 73
translation 230
Homilia II
see Concilium Ephesinum – Coll. Vat. 72
translation 218
Homilia III
see Concilium Ephesinum – Coll. Vat. 71
translation 209
Homilia IV 107, 110, 114-7, 119, 125, 132, 166
Homilia VI
translation 214
Homilia dubia in s. deiparam et in nativitatem domini 13
Homilia in BMV
see Homilia dubia in s. deiparam et in nativitatem domini
Homilia in BMV et Symeonem
see Homilia IV

Index of Old and New Testament passages

OT

Gen.
1:26-8 192
1:27 226
1:31 225
1:32 244
2:7 226
2:9 230
3 155, 192
3:1 192-3
3:13-4 193

Ex.
3:2 219
3:6 220
3:14 175
7:20 236
10:22 136, 236
19:16 238

Ps.
79(80):2 241
98(99):1 241
101:28 231

Isa.
1:3 239
11:10 230

Jer.
1:10 129, 147, 210
5:22 241

Job
10:11 226

Dan.
3:48 236
3:50 236

Mal.
3:6 232

Bar.
3:3 231

NT

Matth.
1:18-25 114
2 218, 235
2:2 242
2:9 241-2
2:11 134
2:13 73, 136
4:1-11 192
9 103
9:5-6 103
10:20 142
12:32 142
14:13-21 213
14:22-32 213
15:32-9 213
16 96, 134, 138
16:13-20 103, 133, 137, 215-6
16:18 46, 80
16:20 215
17:17 215
21:33-46 53
26:37-44 213
26:53 160, 238
26:60-1 60

Mark
1:12-5 192
12:1-12 53

Luke
1:31 100, 164, 185, 212
2:13-4 241
2:14 241
2:7 239
4:1-13 192
4:2 213
10:39 233
20:9-19 53

John
1:10 182, 219
1:11 182, 219
1:14 175, 214, 221
6:1-15 213
6:16-21 213
9:1.6 222
10:12 145
18:20 63
20:19 233
20:21-2 172

Rom.
4 156
8 238
8:8 107
11 107
15:19 142
16:24 195

1Cor.
1:23 165, 189, 232
1:24 233
2:4 142
2:8 234
2:14 232
10:21 242

2Cor.
8:9 195, 240

Eph.
3:5 142
6:10-7 139

Phil:
2 87, 163-4, 175, 178, 184, 186-7, 194
2:5 100, 184, 212
2:5ff. 176-7, 185
2:5-7 172, 175
2:5-11 181
2:6 164, 177, 184, 212-3, 232-3
2:6ff. 185
2:6-7 186
2:6-7a 176, 212-3
2:7 185, 232
2:7b 213
2:8 164, 234
2:8a 213
2:9 234

Col:
1:5a 198
2:9 227
2:14 157, 234

Heb:
1:3 223
1:14 237
10:29 195
12:1 243
13:8 235

Rev.
4:4 151
12 192
12:4 192
14:13 198

General index

Acacius of Beroea 25, 54, 85
Acacius of Melitene 15, 52, 85, 88-90, 186, 202
  homiletics 12-4, 71, 80, 89, 92, 98, 109, 122-3, 149, 155
  role at Ephesus 431 54, 56, 58-60, 62-4, 69-71, 80-1, 83-4, 89
Alexander of Aphrodisias 169
Ambrose 59
Amphilochius of Iconium 125
Ancyra
  city and see 2, 7, 11, 17-8, 21, 28-34, 45, 85, 88, 166, 175, 188, 204
  links to dioceses 17, 22-3, 42-3, 45, 49, 67, 83, 85-6, 88, 110, 112-6
  preaching in 16, 66, 89, 108, 110-2, 166, 170, 187, 205
Andrew of Samosata 170
Ankara
  see Ancyra
antijudaism 104, 107, 165, 189
Antioch
  'Antiochene theology' 13, 25, 34, 43, 45-6, 66, 89, 103, 111-3, 128, 142, 153, 167
  'classical education' 11, 29, 33-4, 65
  Synod of (438) 87, 89
Antiochus 19
Apollinarianism 26, 42, 44, 112
Aquileia, Synod of (381) 59
Aretaeus 169
Arianism 24, 26, 105, 112, 145, 183, 204
Aristotle, Aristotelian 169, 182
asceticism
  see monasticism
Asterius 167
Athanasius 47, 108, 139, 160, 166, 175, 204
Atticus of Constantinople 38
Basil of Ancyra 32
Basil of Caesarea 33
Candidianus (*comes domesticorum*) 48-52, 68, 70, 72, 74, 76, 141, 146
Canons 23-4, 44, 86, 115
Cassian of Marseilles
  see John Cassian
Celestine 26, 42, 46, 62, 70, 73, 75, 113, 160, 186
  legates of 46, 77-9
  letters 46, 50, 59-60, 70, 77, 79-80, 133, 143
Chalcedon
  Council of (451) 2, 4, 25, 30, 37, 41, 48, 52, 67, 89, 116-7, 173, 190, 202, 206
  meeting at (431) 52, 83-4, 97, 119
Chalcedonian theology 88, 120, 125-6, 170, 173
Codex
  Codex Iustinianus 120
  Codex Theodosianus 19, 44, 120
Constantinople 7, 20, 25-6, 32, 76, 97
  Council of (381) 14, 22, 25, 43-4, 54, 72, 153, 158
  court 18, 27, 123
  influence on dioceses 22-3, 67, 142, 204
  population 67, 74
creeds
  elaboration of 25, 86, 101, 205-6
  Nicene 16, 24-5, 54-6, 58, 86, 101, 139, 169, 206
  reliance on 38, 44, 56, 86, 131, 205
Cyril
  authoritative teaching 14, 55-7, 78, 82, 87, 94-5, 99, 100, 122-3, 126, 130, 134-9, 146, 149, 176, 186, 194, 202, 206
  complaints against 43-4, 52, 68
  education and career 2, 11
  homilies 8, 14, 90, 92-3, 95, 97, 100, 112, 121-3, 128
  influence of
    at court 18, 44, 72, 74, 80, 113, 152
    on dioceses 42, 47, 67, 80, 88-9, 113, 135, 138, 170
    wealth and violence 29, 54, 85, 135, 146-7

links to Athanasius 140, 204
role at Ephesus 431 46, 49-52, 60, 62, 70, 77, 95, 138
deposition 75, 81, 85, 130, 134, 141, 147, 149
theology 128, 153, 187
Christology 27, 112, 154, 158-9, 165-70, 174-7, 182, 185-6
Trinitarian debate 112, 174, 204
devil 145, 156, 160-1, 164, 191-3, 195
didactic topos 129-30, 137, 150
dyophysitism 173, 204
Ephesus, Council of (431)
returns, immediate aftermath 85-90
session of 22 June
assent to Coll. Vat. 4 54-7
condemnation of Coll. Vat. 5 57-9
Nestorius' absence 50-4
Nestorius' preaching in Ephesus 61-3
outcome in letters and sermons 71-8
preparations for 42-9
references to 'two or three months old babe' 60, **68-70**
testimonies against Nestorius 59-61
verdict against Nestorius 70-1
sessions of 10-31 July 20, 22, 25, 54, 69, 72, **77-81**, 122, 202
delegations to the emperor 17, **82-5**, 97, 119, 124, 202
Ephesus, Synod of (449) 41-2
Ephrem of Antioch 116
Epiphanius (deacon) 125
Epiphanius of Salamis 170
Euoptius 59, 83
Eusebius of Ancyra 2, 17, 67
Eusebius of Cæsarea 10, 24
Eusebius of Dorylaeum 122, 158
Eustathius 170
Eutherius of Tyana 42, 87
Evagrius 189, 191
Fidus of Joppa 59-60
Firmus of Cæsarea 42, 50, 55, 57, 59, 77, 79, 83, 87-8
Flavian of Philippi 47, 56-9, 63, 81
florilegia 3, 65, 67, 96, 115, 126, 132, 161, 173, 176
Formula of Reunion of 433 43, 89, 115, 140, 190
friendship 1, 11, 59-60, 63-7, 141, 143-4
Galenus 169
Georgius Chortatzes 166
Gregory of Nazianzus 14, 47, 99, 167, 175, 187, 192
Gregory of Nyssa 36, 103, 156, 169-71, 190
Hellenism 104, 106, 165, 189
Henoticon 173
heretical genealogies 26, 88, 104-7, 115, 146, 159, 161, 165, 195
homiletic genres 2, 8, 10-2, 35, 69, 93, 99, 105, 119, 128, 147-9
Jerome 69
John (*comes sacrarum largitionum*) 24, 45, 81, 83
John Cassian 69
attribution to Cassian of Marseilles 69
John Chrysostom 11, 25-6, 30, 33, 51, 54, 171, 183
John of Antioch
leadership 42-3, 202
links to
court 85-6
dioceses 42, 83, 85, 118
role at Ephesus 431 43, 45-6, 48, 65, 70, 74, 81, 95
deposition 54, 67, 70, 81
John Philopponus 170
Justin Martyr 10
Justinian 29, 88, 101, 192
Juvenal 202
knowledge of Latin 84, 110
role at Chalcedon 451 52
role at Ephesus 431 50, 54-5, 57, 59, 81
Latin 20, 33, 46, 80, 84, 97, 110, 122-3, 166, 186
Leo of Rome (the Great) 186
Leontius of Ancyra 32-3
Leontius of Byzantium 174
Libanius 17, 29-30, 33, 99
Marcellus of Ancyra 32, 159-60
Mary 13, 27, 61, 66, 92, 108, 116-7, 159, 185
church in Ephesus 49, 93-4
Maximian 83, 85, 87, 97, 119, 170
Maximus of Turin 101
medical topos 64, 75, 77, 129-30, 133, 150

Memnon
  complaints against 48, 54, 62, 95, 130, 147
  praise of 134, 147, 150
  role at Ephesus 431 46-8, 50, 54-5, 58, 81-2, 94, 150
    deposition 70, 75, 134
miaphysitism, monophysitism 57, 88, 120, 126, 168, 173, 178, 204
monasticism 22, 26, 29-32, 38, 40, 42-3, 64, 66, 85, 87-8, 94, 112, 135, 187, 189-92
Montanism 32
Nestorius
  education and career 2, 10-1, 28, 34, 66, 83
  homiletics 61, 73, 76, 89, 91
  links to
    court 14, 19, 23, 48
    dioceses 42, 46, 67, 69, 111-3
  Nestorianism 14, 89, 106, 115, 159-61, 174, 191
  on Mary, *Theotokos* 28, 61, 117, 159
  role at Ephesus 431 43, 57-63, 68-73, 139, 142, 193
    deposition 81-3, 89, 95
    refusal to attend 49-54, 58, 64, 70
  theology 112, 160, 175-7, 185-8
Nicaea, Council of (325) 21, 23, 25, 44, 50, 56
Nicephorus 70
Nilus of Ancyra 29-30, 32
Novatianism 33
orality 34-5, 39, 100-2
Origen, Origenists 9, 107, 140, 156, 188
orthodoxy
  defence of 3, 15, 33, 72, 99, 116-8, 142-3, 155, 202-4
  formulation of 26, 32, 37-8, 89, 95, 101, 109, 111, 131, 136, 139
  of texts and individuals 44, 54, 57, 60, 62, 64-5, 104, 140, 146, 191-2, 194-5
  reception 90, 125-6, 174
Palladius of Amaseia 57, 59
Palladius of Aspuna 29-30
Paul of Samosata 159-60
Photinus 158-60
Pius of Pessinus 49
Plato, neoplatonism 130, 181, 184
Plutarch 169
Proclus 6, 9, 11-2, 15, 17, 32, 36, 43, 66, 76, 89-92, 100, 107, 114, 119-22, 126, 159, 160, 189
Procopius 166
Pseudo-Athanasius 13, 105
Pulcheria 13, 18, 27
Rheginus of Cyprus 15
Sabellianism 105, 159, 161
Serdica 22, 105
Severian of Gabala 11, 15
Sophronius of Jerusalem 1, 66
Theodore of Mopsuestia 33, 38, 44, 88-9, 165
Theodoret of Cyrrhus 42, 46-8, 66, 84, 87-8, 114, 126, 202, 204
Theodorus Studites 166
Theodosius I 17, 23, 31
Theodosius II 17-20, 23-4, 44-5, 78, 85, 120
Theodotus
  Christology **152-79**
    Christ's life **162-5**
    crucifixion 157, 161, **163-5**, 199
    fall of mankind 143-5, **155-7**, 192-4, 199
    incarnation 73, 137, 144, 151, 154-5, **157-64**, 169, 172, 178, 180, 185, 192-5
    vocabulary **165-79**
    ἐνυπόστατος, οὐσιώδης **168-71**
    οἰκονομία 168, **171-2**, **177-8**, 199
    φύσις 126, 151, **172-9**
  education and career 2, 11, 17, 20-2, 29, 33-4, 83, 153, 182, 205
  homiletics, conciliar
    audience **94-6**, **129-31**
    liturgical setting **93-4**
    church and council in, **128-9**, **131-4**
    Cyril (leadership, teaching) **134-41**
    encomiastic and didactic aspects **147-52**
    reception **118-20**
    uncertainties, error, violence **141-7**
    venue **96-8**
  links to Antioch 11, 33-4, 65, 153, 204
  meaning of sacra 39, 82, 110, 165-6

theology (see also Christology)
church **193-200**
conceptual division 176, 182, **184-91**
economy 87, 151, 154-5, 168, **171-2**, **179-80**, 195, 198
evil 129-30, 156, **179-80**, **191-3**, 195, 198-200
exegesis of *Phil.* 2:5-11 **181-4**
human reasoning 84, 87, 106, 116, 162, 177, **179-91**, 205
salvation 3, 15, 33, 58, 64-5, 101, 116, 127, 138, 144-5, 154-6, 172, **192-200**, 203-4, 206
wonders, miraculous 103, 111, 119, 162-4, **179-82**, 184, 190, 199
transmission, reception of, 2, 108, 112, 118. **120-6**. 202
collections **120-4**
Theophilus 140
Theotokos
see Mary
violence 2, 24, 33, 52, 141, 145, 147
Vitale 87, 89, 118

PRINTED ON PERMANENT PAPER • IMPRIME SUR PAPIER PERMANENT • GEDRUKT OP DUURZAAM PAPIER - ISO 9706
N.V. PEETERS S.A., WAROTSTRAAT 50, B-3020 HERENT